

Anno 1778.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY



OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES
LIBRARY



Taylor Memorial
Library

THE HISTORICAL
ANTIQUITIES OF THE GREEKS

WITH REFERENCE
TO THEIR POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS.

FROM THE GERMAN OF
WILLIAM WACHSMUTH.

VOLUME I.

OXFORD PRINTED BY D A TALBOYS

THE HISTORICAL
ANTIQUITIES OF THE GREEKS

WITH REFERENCE
TO THEIR POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

BY WILLIAM WACHSMUTH
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN
BY EDMUND WOOLRYCH ESQ.

VOLUME I.



OXFORD, D. A. TALBOYS

AND 113 FLEET-STREET LONDON

M DCCC XXXVII.

938
W12h
V.1

THE two volumes of which a translation is now offered to the English reader form the first part of Professor Wachsmuth's treatise on Grecian Antiquities, a work which occupies a distinguished place in the estimation of the learned in Germany, and has been mentioned in terms of high commendation by eminent scholars in this country. In the execution of his task the translator has adhered to the form of the original, as closely as appeared consistent with perspicuity, but whilst he has cautiously abstained from making alterations which involved any departure from the sense of his author, he has not considered himself precluded from giving a free translation of passages, where a literal version would have been ambiguous or obscure. How far he has succeeded in rendering the translation clear and intelligible must be left to the judgment of the reader; but he hopes that in the estimate that may be formed of the manner in which he has acquitted himself of his task, some allowance will be made for the difficulties he has had to contend with—difficulties arising no less from the character of many of the disquisitions contained in the work itself, than from the peculiarities of the author's style, which occasionally is not readily intelligible even to German readers.

A general index will be published with the fourth volume. The second part of the work, in two volumes, will appear as soon as the translation is completed.

London, June, 1837.

PREFACE.

THE investigation of the history, political condition, and monuments of ancient Greece, has for some time past been prosecuted with the greatest ardour and success: the labours of able enquirers in Germany and other countries have awakened the warmest interest in the learned world generally, inspired the proficients in antiquarian science with the desire of imitating their example, and raised the demands of those who are qualified to judge of such researches. Hence it becomes more than ever incumbent upon the person who undertakes a new work upon the subject, to form to himself a clear and definite notion of the object he has in view, whilst it is no less natural that the author should wish to guard against misconception in others as to the nature and intention of his performance.

Since the regeneration of the study of Grecian antiquities, various portions of the ample field of enquiry which that science embraces, have been cultivated with a zeal and assiduity that have borne the choicest fruits. But much still remains to be accomplished; and a painful and discouraging contrast to the fresh beauty of those more favoured portions of the antiquarian domain, is presented in the dreary aspect of those which have not yet been visited by the fostering and renovating care of culture. Under such circumstances, what can be more natural in itself, or more calculated to promote science by its results,

than for the antiquarian to devote his attention to those branches of the subject, which stand most in need of elucidation? But, on the other hand, it may be asked, will not the attempt to produce a general picture of Grecian life, before its individual parts have been thoroughly and satisfactorily explored, be pronounced rash and premature? And will not the writer, who is bold enough to undertake such a task, be sternly reminded, that he thereby proves himself ignorant of the true nature and real demands of science? To this I reply, that not only may the want of the requisite means and opportunities entirely cramp and defeat the efforts of a writer, however desirous he may be of entering into an exhaustive investigation of particular subjects—but it is moreover essentially opposed to the nature of the human mind, to consider itself prohibited from examining a scientific structure as a whole, because certain parts of that structure may have been thrown down and built up again, while the rest remains in its imperfect and now incongruous state. Aristotle has observed that the whole must necessarily exist before the part¹; and it may be affirmed, that whilst the individual parts of a thing undergo various modifications according to the particular stages of development through which they respectively pass, the image of the whole firmly and abidingly exists in the human mind. Moreover, unless the spirit of enquiry has become altogether extinct, it would be as absurd as the expectation of the rustic at the river's side, to wait for the

¹ Τὸ γὰρ ὅλον πρότερον ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τοῦ μέρους, Aristot. Pol. 1. 1. 11.

arrival of an all-sufficient harvest, before we arrange and distribute our provisions. Will any one assert, that no general history of Germany ought to be written, until an equal degree of research shall have been employed upon all the particular histories which it embraces, or till all the sources shall be published? If, lastly, in the mental world, the individual mind be entitled to assert its natural freedom and independence, then an author is at liberty to pursue that train of enquiry to which his feelings impel him; and his scientific labours must be estimated wholly without reference to the wants and demands of the age.

Accordingly the work, of which the first part is now offered to the reader, and which is designed to exhibit a view of the whole civil and political life of the Greeks, I have undertaken from the interest I feel on the subject. And as I have followed the bias of my own mind in the principles by which I have been guided in this survey, without reference to the demands to which I have adverted, so it has been equally foreign from my purpose to endeavour wholly and absolutely to satisfy the opposing claims of those who loudly insist upon the necessity of compiling all that has been effected in the various departments of Grecian antiquities; though it must be confessed, that the want of such a compilation has long been sensibly felt.

I have elsewhere observed² that the method in which the study of antiquities has hitherto been treated is an unscientific one. Though repeated

² See my plan of a Theory of History, 1820, p. 16.

attempts in academical lectures to carry into execution the plan which I then contemplated, namely, to blend history and antiquities into one great picture, by removing the barriers by which they were divided, have convinced me that it is not practicable; still my opinion with regard to the want of scientific unity in the antiquarian structure remains unaltered. In former works, some of which have been distinguished by the praiseworthy care and diligence with which they have been compiled, antiquities have been treated as an auxiliary science, solely destined for the illustration and explanation of the ancient authors: but the circle of the subjects included in them has been more and more enlarged, and in every new work the materials have been arranged in as scientific a form as their extent and diversity would admit of. Still the manifold imperfections of these performances, arising from their encyclopedic character, are obvious to every one.

That branch of these so-styled antiquities in which the dwellings, dress, furniture, and implements of the ancients are treated of is eminently defective, and these dull compilations forcibly remind us of the spiritless banquet of Athenæus. It would perhaps render these subjects more instructive and attracting, if they were considered in an archæological point of view, and if the description of them were made subservient to, and connected with the illustration of existing monuments. The severe censure which Ruhnkenius³ passed

³ *Oratio de doctore umbrat. Opusc. 119*:—*pædagogorum ingeniis relinquendæ sunt insulsæ de veterum calceis, annulis, fibulis et pœnulis compilationes.*

upon the older treatises on these so-called antiquities was by no means undeserved, nor do I feel the least inclination to prolong their existence.

On the other hand, many important and extensive departments of Grecian antiquities have long since assumed the character of distinct and substantive sciences, and have recently had the most sedulous care and attention bestowed upon them. But this has not only had the effect of still farther loosening the frail band by which the fabric of Grecian antiquities was formerly held together, but has increased the difficulty of treating this subject according to the ancient method; for a mind bent upon searching and comprehensive investigation, must now more than ever despair of being able to grasp it in its whole extent and diversity; whilst encyclopedic abstracts and compilations only tend to destroy an inclination for original research, and do not at least in real science advance us a single step.

Hence, in order to produce such a picture of ancient life as should accord with my own views on the subject, and possess that unity of design which is essential to a work of science, it was necessary that it should be considered under an entirely new aspect. This is indicated in the title, and requires a few words of explanation here. I have endeavoured to consider Grecian antiquities with reference to the state, i. e., in a political point of view. Now, if the state were merely to be regarded as the outward form which includes within it the various phenomena of the life of the Greeks as men, and these phenomena were treated as though they were destitute of all inward con-

nection, and merely as held together by an outside frame, then, it must be confessed, we should gain but little by selecting it as our point of reference: but view the state in its living, fertilizing, creative, and preserving activity, and then we shall have the unity of conception we require, and be enabled to separate that which properly falls within our field of enquiry from that which is foreign to it. The former comprises everything that pertains to, and is an essential ingredient of the governing power of the state itself, or that is controlled, penetrated, and modified by that power. Under the latter is included everything that appears as the result of chance or caprice, all that is detached and insulated, forming no part of a connected political system, not referrible to the state, and exerting no reactive force such as to modify its form or influence public life in general:

Thus defined, the whole subject resolves itself into two main branches.

I. Those constituents of the state, from which its ordering and fashioning power is derived—the Constitution.

II. The life of the members of the state, so far as it is determined by the agency of the state—the Government.

The first branch comprises a description of,

1. The personal rank and rights of the members of the state, with reference to their share in the supreme power.

2. The supreme power itself, and the public authorities in which it is vested.

The second contains the three principal duties of the government.

1. To provide for the physical subsistence and well-being of the state—political economy commencing with the measures for ensuring a supply of the first necessities of life, and for the regulation of the simple trades, and ascending to the artificial machinery of finance—the monetary and fiscal systems.

2. To preserve legal order and security, and internal and external independence—law—police—armed force.

3. To promote mental culture and civilization in general—public education, health, strength, virtuous relation between the sexes, the rational use of the products of nature, science, art, moral feeling, religion.

In the application of this scheme to any particular state, the enquiry must be preceded by an historical account of the material and personal constituents of the same, namely, its land and people, as it is only thereby that we can become acquainted with the peculiar circumstances under which a state was constituted and gain a correct notion of its nature. Again, the filling up of the preceding outline depends in a great measure upon the peculiar character of the people to be described. The character of the Greek nation, which was composed of various single states, possessed of a common nationality, but standing in very slight political connection, will render a two-fold method of treatment necessary, inasmuch as the consideration of that which was peculiar to individual states must be prosecuted coincidently with that which was common to the whole nation, and care must be taken not to suppress the general principle by

giving undue prominence to the particular characteristics of the individual states, as well as not to set up as a general principle that which does not hold good in every particular—whence it has so often happened that Attic usages have been represented as common to the whole of Greece. Hence, in treating of the first branch of the subject, namely, the ordering power in the state, we have not only to regard the internal constitution of the single states, but also their external position with respect to each other; and again both these must be examined in their relation to the predominant power in the state-system.

Whilst thus considering the differences arising from local circumstances, it is equally important that we should describe the development of the political systems of Greece from their commencement to their close in regular historical succession. But this does not necessarily imply that the consideration of Grecian political life must be prosecuted, in conjunction with the regular history of the Grecian states: for the province of the former is to describe that combination of phenomena which constitutes a political order of things; that of the latter to narrate actions and events; still the two are so blended and interwoven that it would be an absurdity to draw a broad line of distinction between them.

Such are the outlines of the task I have undertaken, and hence we shall be able to deduce the rules to be observed in filling them up, for instance as regards the measure of fulness to be expected in the narrative, etc. On the other hand, there is no independent or invariable standard to de-

termine how far it may be necessary to enter into details; the proportion of the parts must be regulated by the dimensions of the whole, and these may be varied according to the particular object with which an enquiry may be conducted. I have made it an invariable rule to refer to the sources themselves for the materials of my investigations. But as this work is not designed to resemble a magazine or general repertory, I have not always considered myself bound to adduce all the authorities upon a question. According to the maxim of Plato⁴, that it is not the number, but the knowledge of the judges which should decide, I considered it sufficient to refer to the most conclusive passages, and when these appeared decisive of the matter in hand, I saw no utility in bringing forward a host of others.

It will also be found that I have frequently referred to the passages in ancient authors only, without noticing the modern writers who may have treated of the subject under discussion. I trust that this will not be regarded as an indication of presumption and self-sufficiency on my part. This also arose from the peculiar character of these investigations, in which it was less my intention to collect all that has hitherto been accomplished in this field, than to give the results of my own enquiries. However, I myself have not always been able to distinguish between that which I have derived from a perusal of the originals, and that with which I may have become acquainted through the researches of others. At the same

⁴ Laches, 184. A.: ἐπιστήμη—δεῖ κρίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ πλήθει τὸ μέλλον καλῶς κριθήσεσθαι.

time I do not attempt to conceal, that upon many subjects I set out with the intention of referring to the sources themselves as though they had never been consulted before, and when I had made what I looked upon as a valuable discovery, I did not always think it incumbent upon me to exercise the suicidal courtesy of anxiously enquiring whether another person had not said the same thing before me. In fact, can any one so entirely divest himself of all previously acquired knowledge as to be able conscientiously to lay claim to the merit of entire originality? I therefore frankly avow, that I am fully sensible of my obligations to the distinguished enquirers as well of former as of our own days; and whenever I have omitted to give a reference to their works, I trust my silence will not be construed into a design to conceal their merits. I have seldom contested the views of others, beyond the simple statement of my own opinion, and never in a controversial or acrimonious spirit, and as I have not always mentioned those whose remarks may have coincided with my own, so I have intentionally refrained from stating those views which differ from mine, unless a special mention of them was indispensably required by the nature of the enquiry. This silence may occasionally subject me to the suspicion of having wished to pass off my own disquisitions and remarks as entirely new and original; but this can only be mischievous, when it can be perceived that the author supposes his readers to be unacquainted with the works of former writers. Lastly, as I have purposely avoided expressing any opinion as to the particular views

of others, so I have thought it equally presumptuous to praise or to censure individuals. In science everything ought to stand upon its own merits, and be approved of or condemned without respect to persons.

Meanwhile I venture to hope that the reception of the first portion of this work may be favourable to the continuation of it. No one is more sensible than myself of its imperfections; but it does not always follow, that those who may perceive an author's faults, are also able to correct them: there is an instructing, awakening, and animating criticism, to whose judgment I shall bow, and whose suggestions will not be without advantage to my scientific labours.

W. WACHSMUTH.

Leipzig, March, 1826.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME THE FIRST.



PAGE

| | |
|------------------|----|
| Preface. | vi |
|------------------|----|

INTRODUCTION. LAND AND PEOPLE.

I. GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF GREECE.

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>a.</i> Sea and Coasts, § 1—4. | 1 |
| <i>b.</i> The Interior, § 5—7 | 13 |
| <i>c.</i> Climate and Natural Productions, § 8. | 29 |

II. THE TRIBES OF GREECE.

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>a.</i> The Pelasgians, § 9. | 34 |
| <i>b.</i> The other Ante-Hellenic Tribes, § 10. | 40 |
| <i>c.</i> The Foreign Settlers, § 11. | 49 |
| <i>d.</i> The Hellenes of the Heroic Age, § 12. | 53 |
| <i>e.</i> The Hellenes as the Collective People of the Historical Age, § 13. | 59 |

III. GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE HABITATIONS OF THE GREEKS WITHOUT THE MOTHER-COUN- TRY, § 14.

70

IV. CHARACTER OF THE GRECIAN NATION, § 15.

86

CONSTITUTIONS AND EXTERNAL POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE GRECIAN STATES.

CHAP. I. THE HEROIC AGE.

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Rise of the Grecian States. The various Classes: Citizens, Slaves, Aliens—Nobles—and Com- mon Freemen, § 16. | 111 |
| 2. The Princely Office, § 17. | 119 |
| 3. The Political Authorities, § 18. | 126 |
| 4. The External Relations amongst the States, § 19. | 137 |

CHAP. II. THE EXTERNAL RELATIONS AMONGST THE
STATES FROM THE DORIC MIGRATION TILL
THE BEGINNING OF THE PERSIAN WARS.

I. WHAT DIVIDED THE GRECIAN STATES.

- a.* Political Character of the Migrations, § 20. . 143
- b.* The Grecian Communities in a state of separation, § 21. 147

II. WHAT UNITED THE GRECIAN STATES.

- a.* Festal Communion, § 22. 154
- b.* Union of States with a Federal Council, § 23. . 167
- c.* The Amphictyonic Council, § 24. 172
- d.* Mutual Hospitality and the Interchange of Civil Rights, § 25. 180
- e.* Associations for the purposes of United Agency, § 26. 186

III. THE STANDARD OF MUTUAL RECOGNITION, AND
OF THE PROCEEDINGS CONNECTED THEREWITH.

- a.* Character of the Individual Grecian States in their political intercourse with each other, § 27. 197
- b.* Political Relation of the Greeks to the Barbarians, § 28. 208

CHAP. III. THE CHANGES EFFECTED IN PERSONAL RANK
UPON THE TERMINATION OF THE HEROIC AGE.

- 1. The Princely Office in its Decline, § 29. . 214
- 2. THE DOMINANT CLASS.
 - a.* The Hereditary Nobility, § 30. 223
 - b.* The Rich, § 31. 234
- 3. The Common Freeman, § 32. 237
- 4. Citizenship in General, § 33. 243
- 5. The Condition of Slaves and Aliens as opposed to Citizenship, § 34. 252

CHAP. IV. ARISTOCRACY (TIMOCRACY) AND DEMOCRACY
IN DIFFERENT STATES.

- 1. The Governing Class, § 35. 263
- 2. The Ancient Aristocracy generally in its Relation to the Demus and the subsequent Oligarchy, § 36. 270

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 3. The Council and the Popular Assembly, § 37. | 277 |
| 4. The Officers of State, § 38. | 283 |

CHAP. V. CONSTITUTIONS ESTABLISHED BY LAW.

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. The Relation of Law to Custom, § 39 . . . | 293 |
| 2. The means which brought about the authority of the Laws, § 40. | 303 |
| 3. Fundamental Laws of Constitutions generally, § 41. | 315 |
| 4. THE FUNDAMENTAL LAWS OF THE SPARTAN AND ATHENIAN CONSTITUTIONS. | |
| <i>a.</i> The Constitution of Lycurgus, § 42. . . . | 321 |
| <i>b.</i> The Constitution of Athens. | |
| <i>a. a.</i> Before Solon. | |
| 1. The Four Phylæ, § 43. | 332 |
| 2. The Subdivisions of the Phylæ, § 44. . | 342 |
| 3. The Political Authorities, § 45. . . . | 355 |
| <i>b. b.</i> The Constitution of Solon | |
| 1. Personal Rank, § 46. | 365 |
| 2. The Political Authorities, § 47. . . . | 378 |
| <i>c. c.</i> The Constitution of Clisthenes, § 48. . . | 390 |

CHAP. VI. THE TYRANNY.

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Survey of the Tyrants till about the time of the Persian Wars, § 49. | 401 |
| 2. The Tyranny in alliance with the Lower Orders, § 50. | 409 |
| 3. Tyranny in the light of Despotism, § 51. . . | 415 |
| 4. Downfal of the Tyranny, § 52. | 421 |

| | |
|-------------------|-----|
| APPENDIX. | 427 |
|-------------------|-----|

CONTENTS.

VOLUME THE SECOND.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| CHAP. VII. MERIDIAN OF DEMOCRACY. | |
| I. INTRODUCTION. THE GREAT PERSIAN WAR, § 53. | 1 |
| II. DEMOCRACY IN GENERAL, § 54. | 21 |
| III. THE ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY. | |
| <i>a.</i> The Character of the People, § 55. | 32 |
| <i>b.</i> Rank of Persons, § 56. | 38 |
| <i>c.</i> The Political Authorities, § 57. | 56 |
| <i>d.</i> The States dependent upon Athens, § 58. | 86 |
| IV. DEMOCRACY WITHOUT THE EMPIRE OF ATHENS, § 59. | 104 |
| 1. ARGOS. | 106 |
| 2. MANTINEA AND TEGEA. | 111 |
| 3. ELIS. | 113 |
| 4. MEGARA. | 114 |
| 5. AMBRACIA AND LEUCAS. | 115 |
| 6. CORCYRA. | 116 |
| 7. EPIDAMNUS. | 117 |
| 8. SYRACUSE. | 118 |
| 9. AGRIGENTUM. | 122 |
| 10. TARENTUM | 123 |
| 11. THURI. | 123 |
| V. THE OLIGARCHY, § 60. | 125 |
| 1. SPARTA. | 129 |
| 2. BÆOTIA. | 133 |
| 3. THESSALY. | 134 |
| 4. STATES IN ALLIANCE WITH SPARTA IN THE PE- LOPONNESUS AND ON THE ÆGEAN SEA. | 136 |
| 5. CRETE. | 137 |
| 6. HERACLEA ON THE PONTUS. | 137 |
| 7. THE GREEK STATES ON THE WESTERN SEAS. | 138 |

CHAP. VIII. THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND
OLIGARCHY IN THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF
GREECE.

FROM THE FLIGHT OF XERXES TILL THE END OF THE PELOPONNESIAN
WAR.

I. THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF GREECE TILL THE BE-
GINNING OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, § 61. . 139

II. STATE OF PARTIES IN THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, § 62. 150

I. TO THE PEACE OF NICIAS.

A. ATHENIAN CONFEDERACY.

a. The Synteleia. 160

b. The independent confederates of Athens. . 162

B. THE PELOPONNESIAN CONFEDERACY.

a. The Peloponnesian Symmachia properly so
called. 165

b. Other Members of the Confederacy without the
Peloponnesus. 166

II. FROM THE PEACE OF NICIAS TILL THE DISCOMFI-
TURE OF THE ATHENIANS IN SICILY. . . 170

III. FROM THE DEFEAT OF THE ATHENIANS IN SICILY
TILL THE END OF THE WAR. 179

III. THE CHARACTER OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR
AND ITS INFLUENCE UPON THE INTERNAL CON-
DITION OF THE GREEK STATES IN GENERAL, § 63. 181

IV. THE INTERIOR OF THE INDIVIDUAL STATES DURING
THE WAR.

a. Athens.

a. a. The Athenian Democracy in general, § 64. . 189

THE POPULAR ASSEMBLY AND THE DEMAGOGY. 194

THE COURTS OF LAW AND SYCOPHANCY. . 201

THE OLD COMEDY. 203

b. b. THE DEMAGOGUES AND THE CHANGES WHICH
THE ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY UNDERWENT DURING
THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, § 65. 227

CLEON AND NICIAS. 230

ALCIBIADES WITH HIS FRIENDS AND OPPO-
NENTS. 236

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE CABALS OF THE OLIGARCHS DURING THE THIRD AND LAST DIVISION OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR. | |
| THE FOUR HUNDRED AND THE FIVE THOU- SAND. | 251 |
| THE FIVE THOUSAND | 261 |
| b. Sparta, § 66. | 266 |
| c. The other independent States of Greece, § 67. | 274 |
| 1. ARGOS. | 274 |
| 2. BÆOTIA. | 276 |
| 3. THESSALY. | 277 |
| 4. CORCYRA. | 278 |
| 5. MEGARA. | 280 |
| 6. THE STATES OF THE EASTERN ISLANDS AND COASTS | 282 |
| 7. THE SICELIOTS. | 283 |

CHAP. IX. THE PREDOMINANCE AND DECLINE OF OLIGARCHY WITH THE HEGEMONY OF SPARTA; THE NEW DEMOCRACY AND THE TYRANNY.

FROM THE END OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR TILL THE TIME OF PHILIP OF MACEDON.

A. ZENITH OF THE OLIGARCHICAL SYSTEM UNDER THE HEGEMONY OF SPARTA.

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. The Political System of Greece till the liberation of Thebes from the Spartan yoke, § 68. | 290 |
| II. The Constitutions established by Sparta, § 69. | 312 |
| 1. ATHENS. THE ANARCHY. | 315 |
| 2. ELIS. | 322 |
| 3. MANTINEA. | 323 |
| 4. PHLIUS. | 323 |
| 5. CORINTH. | 325 |
| 6. THEBES. | 326 |
| III. The interior of Sparta, § 70. | 328 |

B. THE VICTORY OF DEMOCRACY OVER THE HEGEMONY AND OLIGARCHICAL SYSTEM OF SPARTA.

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. The new Democracy of Athens from its restoration to the time of Philip, § 71. | 338 |
|---|-----|

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| THE RESTORATION OF DEMOCRACY. | 341 |
| PERSONAL RANK. | 345 |
| THE DEMUS AS THE LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE POWER. | 348 |
| THE MAGISTRATES. | 350 |
| THE DEMAGOGY. | 352 |
| THE DEMAGOGUES SINGLY. | 355 |
| II. The Democracy of Thebes and its Contests with Sparta, § 72. | 361 |
| III. The Constitutions of the other States which took part in the struggle, § 73. | 381 |
| THE ISLANDS. | 382 |
| THESSALY. | 383 |
| THEBES. | 385 |
| ARGOS. | 386 |
| CORINTH. | 387 |
| SICYON. | 388 |
| ELIS. | 388 |
| ACHAIA. | 389 |
| MESSENIAS. | 389 |
| PHLIUS. | 390 |
| ARCADIA. | 390 |
| MEGARA. | 391 |
| EUBCEA | 391 |
| CORCYRA. | 392 |
| ZACYNTHUS. | 392 |
| THE EASTERN ISLANDS. | 392 |
| IV. The Nationality of the Greeks in general after the end of the Peloponnesian War, § 74. | 393 |
| C. The New Tyranny, together with the Republics in the West, § 75. | 405 |
| 1. THE TWO DIONYSII AND THE REPUBLICS IN THE WEST. | 407 |
| 2. THE TYRANTS OF PHEREE | 418 |
| 3. THE TYRANTS ON THE PONTUS. | 421 |
| 4. LESS POWERFUL TYRANTS. | 423 |

CHAP. X. COMPLETION OF THE INTERNAL CORRUPTION AND
SUBVERSION OF THE EXTERNAL LIBERTIES OF
GREECE.

THE AGE OF PHILIP OF MACEDON.

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. Internal Condition and External Political Relations in general, § 76. | 426 |
| II. Athens, § 77. | 448 |
| III. The other States, § 78. | 472 |
| 1. SPARTA. | 473 |
| 2. MESSENIAN. | 475 |
| 3. ARCADIA. | 476 |
| 4. ELIS. | 477 |
| 5. EUBŒA. | 477 |
| 6. PHOCIS. | 479 |
| 7. THESSALY. | 480 |
| 8. BYZANTIUM. | 482 |
| 9. THE EASTERN STATES. | 483 |
| 10. THE SICELIOTS. | 484 |
| 11. THE ITALIOTS. | 489 |

CHAP. XI. THE SERVITUDE, DELIVERANCE, RELAPSE, AND
POLITICAL EXTINCTION OF THE GREEKS.

THE MACEDONIAN-ROMAN PERIOD.

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. External Political Relations of the States of Greece, § 79. | 491 |
| a. THE MOTHER-COUNTRY AND THE EASTERN STATES. | 491 |
| II. The Interior, § 80. | 521 |
| 1. ATHENS. | 523 |
| 2. SPARTA. | 537 |
| 3. THE OTHER STATES OF THE MOTHER-COUNTRY. | 542 |
| 4. THE STATES ON THE EASTERN ISLANDS AND COASTS. | 547 |
| 5. THE WESTERN STATES. | 550 |
| APPENDIX. | 555 |

INTRODUCTION.

4316

CL
913.38

LAND AND PEOPLE.

I. GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF GREECE.

a. Sea and Coasts.

§ 1. THE land and seas of the primitive seats of the Greeks still bear the traces of violent change, and elemental convulsions appear to have raged at their origin with no less impetuosity than the human passions, which, in a subsequent age, shook the political communities of the natives. One of the traditions of the Samothracian priests recounted¹, that when the sea, which had but recently retired from the land, was not yet encompassed with firm and immovable shores, and still struggled against its ineffectual barriers, the Pontus, originally a crater shut in on all sides, overflowed with the waters of the rivers that discharged themselves into it, and that the outlet which it then forced for itself, formed the Hellespont, and separated Europe from Asia.

That those seas have been subject to irregular tides from the earliest times, is proved by various traditions, such as that of the Ogygian deluge²; the

¹ Diodor. Sic. 5. 47; Strabo, 1. 49. ed. Casaub.; Istrus ap. Eustath. ad Dionys. Perieg. 513; comp. Choiseul-Gouffier, sur l'origine du Bosphore de Thrace, in the Mém. de l'Institut. hist. T. ii. 484, sqq. On the subject of the land of Lyctonia, which was said to have disappeared, see Orph. Argon. 1278.

² Pherecydes, p. 218. Sturz, new edit.

struggle between Poseidon and a land-protecting deity, for the possession of a certain tract of country³; the rising of Rhodes from the sea, and its subsequent inundation⁴; of the separation of the islands Cos and Nisyrus⁵; the settlement of the floating island of Delos⁶; the Symplegades, and Scylla and Charybdis⁷; the lawless current of the Euripus⁸, which had once grown into a proverb⁹ amongst the Greeks, may be regarded as a memorial of the ancient anarchy of nature. The Grecian seas are still agitated by sudden tempests and impetuous whirlpools; and even the rivers of this region partake of the instability of the ocean-waves; they overflow and stagnate by turns; and if, as it has been supposed, the contemplation of calmly-flowing streams engenders habits of study and reflection, the rivers of Greece were calculated to produce very different effects upon the minds of the natives.

The concussions to which the earth was a prey, were augmented by the struggles of the sea with subterranean fires; and the youthful race of the aboriginal inhabitants exercised their courage amidst natural phenomena, as appalling as they were unexampled, and commemorated them in fictions of the wars between the Titans and the Gods, the piling up of mountains and the burning of forests¹⁰, as well as by animated traditions of inland lakes

³ See Apollod. 2. 1. 4. on Argos; *ibid.* 3. 14. 1. and Strabo, 8. 397. on Athens; Pausan. 2. 30. 6. on Træzen, and 2. 1. 6. Corinth.

⁴ Pindar, Ol. 7. 100, sqq.

⁵ Strabo, 10. 488.

⁶ Pindar, *apud* Strab. 8. 485; Schol. in Hom. Odyss. 10. 3.

⁷ Hom. Od. 12. 59, sqq. Apollon. Rhod. 2. 320; comp. Heyne ad Apollod. 85, sqq. Strabo, 8. 378. remarks, that at one time all currents were more violent.

⁸ *Τύχη Εὐριπός*. comp. the *ἄνω καὶ κάτω* Plato, Phædon, 90. Diogenian. Prov. 3. 39; 4. 72.

⁹ Strabo, 9. 403. comp. Spon. voy. p. 248. 252.

¹⁰ Hesiod. Theog. 629. sqq.

contracting into rivers ; and the drying up of valleys, like those of the Thessalian Peneus and the Læonian Eurotas¹¹, which are still attested by the jagged rocks and indented ravines of the mountain-districts of Greece¹². Through the general history of the Grecian states, they are continued in a succession of earthquakes¹³, which overthrew cities, as Sparta¹⁴, Sicyon, Rhodes, together with the towns of Lycia and Caria¹⁵; or covered them with the waves, as in ancient times Arne and Midea in Bœotia¹⁶, as well as Helice and Bura in Achaia¹⁷; cast down mountain-tops, as that of Taygetus¹⁸; tore asunder islands as Therasia and Thera¹⁹; or covered them with the sea, as Chryse near Lemnós²⁰; changed capes into islands, as Atalante by Locris²¹; cast up others from the depths of the sea, as Hieria and Thia, near Thera²²; dried up rivers, like the Bœotian Melas²³,

¹¹ See below § 6 and 7.

¹² Hence Laconia is denominated "the land of the many caverns," *καυεράεσσα* (another reading has *κητώεσσα*) Hom. Il. 2. 581; Od. 4. 1; Strab. 8. 367. *ὅτι οἱ ἀπὸ σεισμῶν ῥωχμοὶ καυετοὶ λέγονται*; comp. Eustath. ad. Hom. Od. ub. supra.

¹³ Strab. 1. 60. Laconia and Eubœa are called "the easily agitated" (*εὐσειστοί*); Strab. 8. 367; 10. 447. and the same on Bœotia, 9. 406; according to Aristot. Meteor. 2. 8. earthquakes were much more frequent on the Hellespont, in Achaia, Sicyon, and Eubœa; Delos was distinguished as being seldom convulsed, Herod. 6. 98; comp. Thucyd. 2. 8, Plin. Hist. Nat. 4. 22. Concerning the frequency and violence of the earthquakes during the Peloponnesian war, see Thucyd. 1. 23.

¹⁴ Ol. 78. 4; Thucyd. 1. 128.

¹⁵ Ol. 140. 3; Polyb. 5. 88; Pausan. 2. 7. 1.

¹⁶ Strab. 1. 59; comp. Thucyd. 3. 87. 89.

¹⁷ Ol. 101. 4; Strab. 1. 59. 8. 384; Polyb. 2. 41; Diod. 15. 48.

¹⁸ Ol. 78. 4; Strab. 8. 367.

¹⁹ Ol. 135. 4; Plin. 4. 23.

²⁰ Onomacritus' prediction of the destruction of an island near Lemnos, (Herod. 7. 6.) implies the occurrence of earlier events of a similar nature; concerning Chryse and the volcano Mosychlos, see Choiseul-Gouffier, voyage 2. 129, sqq.; and Buttmann in the Mus. d. Alterth.wiss. vol. i.; compare Ukert in Geogr. Ephemer. 1812, December.

²¹ Ol. 88. 3; Diodor. 12. 59; comp. Thucyd. 3. 89.

²² 197. B. C., and 96. A. C.; Strab. 1. 57; Plin. 4. 23; Seneca Quæst. Nat. 2. 26; Pausan. 8. 33. 2; Justin, 30. 4; Dio Cass. 60. 29; comp. Choiseul-Gouffier, 1. 23, on planche 13. On the subject of the island which rose near Thera, on the 23d May, 1707, see Philosoph. Transact. an 1788, p. 67. 200—an. 1711, p. 354. In many places between Therasia and Hieria, where the land once projected, the plummet now finds no bottom.

²³ Strab. 9. 407.

or converted them into volcanoes, as on Lemnos²⁴, the abode of Hephæstus, the Arcadian Lycæum²⁵, and Methone²⁶ in Argolis.

§ 2. *The Maritime Territory*, during the earliest periods of Grecian civilisation, must be described, as commencing northward at the mouth of the Hellespont. At this point terminates the Chersonese, at one time a bulwark against the barbarians¹, and afterwards a bridge, by which they crossed from Europe into Asia; and here began what the Greeks denominated “this sea,” or “the sea near us.” The shores of these two quarters of the globe recede, and the waters of the Ægean expand into a spacious gulf, whilst the eye of the mariner could still descry his seamarks, Lemnos and its volcano, Imbrus and Samothrace; the first, as early as the heroic ages, the abode of the Hellenic Minyans, possessed one of the finest harbours in the whole Archipelago³, and the last, though dreaded for the breakers⁴ along its coasts, had no want of ports⁵. Towards the west, follows Thasus with its two harbours⁶; and, somewhat further, from the fruitful Thrace jut out into the sea three inviting strips of land, of which the Greeks were not slow to avail themselves, when their own country became too con-

²⁴ See note 20. Its ancient name, Αἰθάλεια, contains an allusion to its former heat. Comp. Polyb. 34. 11, and the Commentators on Sophocl. Philoctet. 711.

²⁵ Pausan. 8. 29. 1; comp. Dodwell's Classical Tour, 2. 380.

²⁶ Strab. 1. 59; compare at large v. Hoff Gesch. der Veränder. d. Erdoberfläche, 1822, vol. 2.

¹ It was fortified by the elder Miltiades against the Thracians, Herod. 6. 36; Pericles, Plutarch Per. 19; Dercyllidas, Xenoph. Hell. 3. 2. 10.

² Ἡδὲ ἡ θάλασσα, ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν θάλασσα; Herod. 1. 1. 4. 39; Plat. Phæd. 113; Scylax, p. 34, ed. Gronov.; ἡ ἔσω θάλαττα in Polyb. 3. 39, who, according to the Roman custom, applied καθ' ἡμᾶς θάλαττα to the Mediterranean, 16. 29; comp. 3. 37.

³ Kinsbergen Beschreib. d. Archip., translated into German by K. Sprengel, p. 77.

⁴ Importuosissima omnium, Plin. Hist. Nat. 4. 23.

⁵ Scyl. 65.

⁶ Ibid.

fined for them. On the most easterly of these rises Mount Athos, which is visible from cape Sigæum⁷. Its shadow, during the summer solstice, fell upon a brazen ox, in the market-place of the Lemnian city of Myrina⁸; the astonishment of the ancients gave rise to marvellous tales, such as that the sun was visible upon its summit three hours earlier than in the plain⁹. From the western strip of land the Thermaic gulf winds far into Macedonia. Its coast, notwithstanding the eye may discern Olympus and Ossa¹⁰, was never considered purely Grecian. In the Greek seas were situated to the east of Thessaly the four islands of Peparethos, whence Lemnos¹¹ may be descried, Halonnesus, Scopelos, and Sciathos—the first and last containing harbours¹². The Greeks, who were accustomed to coasting, generally steered between Sciathos and cape Sepias into the channel between Thessaly and Eubœa. The northern coast of Eubœa presented the harbour of Histiaæa¹³ (where afterwards lay Oreus); but a still more favourable position for commanding the adjacent region, is the Pagasæan gulf opposite. Traditions were attached to Aphetæ, the tongue of land westward of its mouth, concerning the most ancient maritime expedition to the unknown seas of the north¹⁴, the voyage of the Argonauts. Demetrias, built in its innermost creek, was destined, at a later period, to become one of the

⁷ Chandler's Travels in Asia Minor, p. 23; Clarke's Travels, 2. 1. 165; Choiseul-Gouff. 2. 139, sqq.

⁸ Plin. 4. 23; Solin. 2. 31; Sophocl. in Etym. Magn. "Αθως, Apoll. Rhod. 1. 604, and the proverb in Suidas, "Αθως καλύπτει πλευρά Αημνίας βοός. Comp. Kästner über Höhe und Schatten des Athos.

⁹ Strab. Fragm. vol. 7, p. 331.

¹⁰ Herod. 7. 128.

¹¹ Dionys. Perieg. 522.

¹² Scyl. 51.

¹³ Scyl. 50.

¹⁴ See the passages in Müller Orchomenos, 252.

three fetters of Greece¹⁵; the second was Chalcis in Eubœa¹⁶, on the strait of the Euripus, where the coasts of Eubœa and Bœotia approach to within so short a distance of each other, that a bridge could be thrown over the channel¹⁷, and the passage intercepted, as is the case at the present day¹⁸. To the south of Chalcis, Eretria presented an excellent harbour in Bathys¹⁹, sixty stadia from the Attic Oropus, which lies opposite²⁰. On the coasts of the mainland, along the straits of the Euripus, there were ports at Cynos, belonging to the Locrian city of Opus²¹, as well as at Anthedon and Aulis in Bœotia²². These last are bounded by a spacious and secure bay²³, which once contained the whole of the Grecian fleet assembled for the expedition against Troy.

✕ The narrow sea between Eubœa and the continent, was a channel the more frequented by the Greeks, as the boldest seamen dreaded circumnavigating the external coast of Eubœa, where there was no anchorage²⁴, and which it was even dangerous to approach. Amongst the most notorious spots were the shoals of Coila²⁵, off cape Caphareus²⁶, which proved the destruction of the Grecian fleet on its return from Troy. But Scyros, to the east of Eubœa, was in a very early age connected with

¹⁵ Polyb. 17. 11; Strab. 9. 436; Liv. 32. 34.

¹⁶ Strab. 9. 428.

¹⁷ Ibid. 9. 400. 403; Liv. 31. 24; Hawkins in Walpole's Mem. 539, sqq.

¹⁸ Mannert, Geogr. 8. 256.

¹⁹ Strab. 8. 403.

²⁰ Thuc. 8. 105.

²¹ Strab. 9. 426.

²² Ibid. 9. 403. 404.

²³ Dodwell, 2. 154; and Strab. ub. sup.

²⁴ Geræstus was the only spot where moorings could be found. Liv. 31. 44. says *nobilem portum*; comp. Schol. Thucyd. 3. p. 403. Bipont; Aristophanes, Equit. 561, and Schol. Strab. 10. 446.

²⁵ Liv. 31. 47; Strab. 10. 445, erroneously places them between Geræstus and Aulis, unless the last be corrupt, and the correct reading perhaps be "Ανδρου instead of "Αυλίδος (Andros is opposite Geræstus).

²⁶ Stephan. Byzan. Καφαρ. Etym. Mag. Καφηρεύς. Dio Chrysostom. 1. 222, sqq. 231. ed. Reisk. Hygin. 116. Cape Caphareus was afterwards called the Wood-devourer, ξυλοφάγος; Tzetz. ad. Lycoph. 373.

Greek traditions. Theseus and Achilles were said to have resided with Lycomedes, prince of Scyros²⁷; there is, however, reason to suppose that he was regarded in the light of a foreigner, just as the Dolopes in Scyros were afterwards looked upon as dwelling without the pale of Greece²⁸. From the southern extremity of Eubœa, there is a most tempting passage marked out through the Ægean sea to Asia Minor; an uninterrupted succession of islands rendering the voyage entirely free from danger. The facility of the passage to Delos subsequently became proverbial²⁹. However, there are very faint traces of any Grecian settlement there, from the time of the Ionic migration³⁰. The navigation of these seas, which had such an extensive influence on the national character of the Greeks, belongs to a later age.

§ 3. The east coast of Attica has in Panormus¹ a harbour by no means unimportant, and the roadstead of Thoricus², which is covered by the island of Helena; even cape Sunium, the maritime confine between the Ægean and Myrtoan seas, has a port³. But the bounty of nature is most conspicuous on the coasts of the Saronic gulf, where she had placed the still noble harbour of Piræus, and near it the creeks of Phalerum and Munychia⁴, the port of Salamis (now *Koluri*), one of the best in

²⁷ Plut. Thes. 41; Hom. Od. 11. 508.

²⁸ Thucyd. 1. 98; Plut. Cim. 8.

²⁹ Zenob. Prov. 2. 37.

³⁰ Delos occurs in Hom. Od. 6. 162; but the Hellenic panegyris around the altar of Apollo on that island, did not begin till after the Ionian migration. Compare below, § 14, where also see the account of the Dorian settlements on the more southern islands.

¹ Chandler, Trav. in Greece, p. 157; Mannert, 8. 300.

² Hom. Hymn. in Cerer. 126; Kinsbergen, 53.

³ Scylax, 47. incorrectly says two.

⁴ See Meurs. Piræus, and the ample description in Mannert, 8. 808, sqq.

Europe⁵, the once celebrated port of Nisæa, belonging to Megara, formed by the foreland of Minoa⁶, and Cenchreæ⁷, belonging to Corinth; those of Ægina, situate in the channel most traversed in the maritime intercourse of the natives, but the entrance to which, as in Samothrace, was attended with great difficulty⁸; the commodious harbour of Epidaurus⁹ opposite, not far from which are the excellent roads of Trœzen, called Pogon¹⁰, covered by the island of Calauria. The communication between the Saronic and Corinthian gulfs is intercepted by the isthmus, which is forty stadia wide in its narrowest part. The advantages of such a channel were recognised at an early period, and the removal of the impediment did not appear altogether impracticable. But the attempts to cut through the isthmus belong to a later age¹¹. The passage into the gulf of Argolis first lay along the Actè, as it was called¹², and then round cape Scyllæum, westward of which there are a number of reefs and rocky islands, such as Hydrea¹³, Tipareus (now *Spezzia*), etc.; and which, though not calculated for the settlement of peaceable citizens, are by no means inconvenient stations for the shipping of fearless mariners. In the gulf of Argolis, nature has been most lavish of her favours to the bay of Argos; the port of Nauplia (*Napoli di Romania*) is, it must be confessed, shallow in itself, and only

⁵ Kinsberg. 46; Dodwell, 1. 564, sqq.

⁶ Strabo, 9. 391.

⁷ Ibid. 8. 380.

⁸ Pausan. 2. 29. 5; Müller, *Æginet.* p. 4. n. 5.

⁹ Dodwell, 2. ch. 7.

¹⁰ Herod. 8. 42; Strab. 8. 373.

¹¹ On that of Periander, which appears very doubtful, see Diog. Laert. 1. 99; concerning the attempt of Demetrius Poliorcetes, Strab. 1. 59; on Cæsar's, Sueton. 44; Nero's, Sueton. 19; Plin. Hist. Nat. 4. 4; Pausan. 2. 1. 5; Lucian, 9. 266, sqq. Bipont.

¹² Paus. 2. 8. 4; Plutarch, Arat. 40; comp. Wesseling ad Diodor. 12. 43, and 15. 31; Müller, Dor. 1. 81, note 2.

¹³ Herod. 3. 59; Pausan. 2. 34. 9; Hecataeus ap. Steph. Byzant. Ὑῆρεα.

adapted for smaller vessels; nor was it of much importance in ancient times¹⁴; but its roads, which are, by far, more extensive than was required by the scale on which navigation was in those days conducted, are large enough to contain nearly two hundred ships of the line, and are only exposed to south-easterly winds¹⁵. The east coast of Laconia only possessed the harbour of Epidaurus Limera¹⁶ (*Napoli di Malvasia*). As the inhabitants were exceedingly averse from intercourse with their neighbours, it was seldom touched at; but the southern extremity of Laconia, with the promontory of Malea, was no less dreaded than the east coast of Eubœa; and as it was owing to this circumstance that the Euripus and Chalcis attained their high consideration, so through the peril attending the attempt to double Malea¹⁷, Corinth, where the ships were hauled over the isthmus¹⁸, became the principal depot of trade¹⁹. Malea was no less notorious for its sudden and dangerous squalls, than for the violent winds that blew from the north-west, known by the name of the Etesiaë²⁰, during which²¹ vessels would not answer to their helm in the passage round the point. On the other hand, these winds seem at a very early period to have promoted an intercourse between the Peloponnesus, and perhaps the northern provinces²² and the island of Crete, only eighty miles from Malea, and whither they once

¹⁴ Plin. Hist. Nat. 4. 19.

¹⁵ Kinsbergen, 25. 27.

¹⁶ Paus. 3. 23. 6; Hesych. Λιμηρά. Schol. Thucyd. 4. p. 476. Bipont; comp. Coronelli Morea, p. 111.

¹⁷ There was a proverb, "When thou doubtest Malea, forget those at home," Μαλεάς δὲ κάμψας ἐπιλάθου τῶν οἴκαδε, Strab. 8. 378.

¹⁸ Δίολλκος, see § 6. n. 49.

¹⁹ Besides this it had the advantage mentioned by Dio. Chrys. 1. 276; ὥσπερ ἐν τριόδῳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἔκειτο.

²⁰ See Append. 1.

²¹ Διὰ τὰς ἀντιπνοίας, Strab. 8. 378.

²² Müller Dor. 1. 31.

drove Ulysses²³. But in examining the ties which, in the remoteness of antiquity, were contracted between Crete and the Grecian continent, it must be borne in mind, that although the north coast of Crete possesses excellent harbours²⁴, their approach is rendered extremely difficult by the adjacent sandbanks, and that the sea northward of Crete was described as in the highest degree tempestuous²⁵; consequently the establishment of the earliest intercourse, as well as the dominion of that sea²⁶, would with less probability be ascribed to the strangers, whom the force of the Etesian winds drove to the island, than to its inhabitants, who were familiar with the character of the neighbouring sea, and who could from their own Ida behold Cythera and Taygetus, as well as Rhodes and Asia Minor²⁷.

§ 4. After the passage round Malea was effected, the navigation between the Laconian coast and Cythera was attended with great difficulty¹. Earthquakes several times altered the soundings, and cape Onugnathus, once attached to the mainland², afterwards became an island³. Cythera had two ports⁴; the south coast of Laconia had none, whilst that of Gytheum was formed by art⁵. The Achillean harbour, near cape Tænarus, as well as that of Psamathus⁶ opposite, are unimportant. Off the Messenian coast, near Corone, there is nothing but an anchor-

²³ Odyss. 19. 186.

²⁴ Höckh, Crete, 1. 94.

²⁵ Sophocl. Trach. 118; Horat. Od. 1. 26. 1.

²⁶ Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 4; Diodor. 4. 17.

²⁷ Höckh, 1. 4.

¹ Plin. Hist. Nat. 4. 19.

² Strab. 8. 363.

³ Riedesel, Remarq. d'un voyageur moderne, p. 12.

⁴ Scyl. 38; Thucyd. 4. 54. has but one; comp. Zach. Geogr. Ephem. 1798, p. 50.

⁵ Strab. 8. 363.

⁶ Scyl. 37; Paus. 3. 25. 4; Steph. Byz. Ψαμαθῶς.

age-ground; at Methone indifferent roads⁷, to the east of which is situate the unimportant harbour of Phænicus⁸. The west coast of the Peloponnesus is better provided. There is the first rate harbour of Pylos (*Navarino*)⁹, which is covered by the island of Sphacteria¹⁰; that of Cyparissia¹¹ very commodious, and further northward is Cyllene¹², the port of Elis. Some of the ancients make the gulf of Corinth¹³ begin between the promontory Araxus, and the mouth of the Achelous, which pours its waters into the sea opposite; to the east the shores gradually approach, and not far from the narrowest part of the strait are the roads of Patræ, the situation of which is one of unusual excellence, though the harbour itself is insignificant¹⁴. Soon afterwards the extremity of Achaia and Locris, Rhium and Antirrhium¹⁵, like the straits of the Hellespont, approach to within seven stadia of each other, and are not unaptly termed the keys of the Hellespont. This is the real mouth of the gulf¹⁶. Eastward, at a short distance from Rhium, projects the point of Drepanon, and between the two sweeps the double bay of Panormus¹⁷. The whole gulf was not originally called *Corinthian*, but *Crissæan*¹⁸, from its principal division, the spacious bay of Phocis: what formed its eastern boundary was named the Alcyonian sea¹⁹, and it was not till the time of Thucydides²⁰

⁷ Kinsbergen, 210. The fifth Æpytid Dotadas established a station for shipping there. Paus. 4. 3. 6.

⁸ Paus. 4. 34. 7.

⁹ Kinsbergen, 206, sqq. ¹⁰ Thucyd. 4. 8, sqq.

¹¹ Scylax, p. 36. only mentions this one; he says nothing of Pylos.

¹² Paus. 6. 26. 3. ¹³ Strab. 8. 335.; 10. 450.

¹⁴ Strab. 8. 387. ¹⁵ Τὸ ἑτερον ῥῖον, Thucyd. 2. 86.

¹⁶ Ibid. ¹⁷ Strab. 8. 335; Paus. 7. 22. 7; Thucyd. 2. 86.

¹⁸ Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 431; Thucyd. 1. 107; 2. 85.

¹⁹ See with reference to the corrupt passage in Strab. 8. 336. Mannert, 8. 152. ²⁰ As in Polyb. 4. 57.

that the gulf of Corinth became a general denomination. Off the Achæan coast there is a most violent surf²¹; its harbours at Erineos²², Ægira²³, Pallene²⁴, and even Sicyon²⁵, are unimportant; and vessels were not considered to be effectually sheltered till they had reached the Corinthian port of Lechæum. The navigation along the Megaro-Bœotian coast was endangered by reefs and violent mountain-winds²⁶. The Megarian Pagæ²⁷ and the Thespian Creusis²⁸ both had ports. The harbour of Cirrha in Phocis²⁹ was admirably situated; it is true it was filled up in the first holy war, but it still continued to be a safe anchorage³⁰. Equally commodious were the harbour of Anticirrha³¹ and that of Naupactus³² (*Le-panto*), till very recently, the chief emporium of modern Greece. However, the Corinthian gulf can never become as important as the Saronic; as the latter may be approached without difficulty or danger, whilst the narrow entrance of the former is obstructed by those imperious bulwarks, the islands of the Ionian sea, Cephallenia, Zacynthus, and Ithaca³³. Especially formed for maritime warfare and for endangering the surrounding seas, is Acarnania³⁴, with its numerous ports; near the site of

²¹ Plutarch. Arat. 21.

²² Thucyd. 7. 34.; Paus. 7. 22. 7.

²³ Paus. 7. 26. 1.

²⁴ Pausan. 7. 26. 7.

²⁵ Xenoph. Hell. 7. 3. 2; Polyb. 5. 27. The city and harbour were separate.

²⁶ Paus. 9. 23. 1.

²⁷ Thucyd. 1. 111.

²⁸ Strab. 9. 410; Creusa; Liv. 36. 21; 44. 1.

²⁹ That Cirrha and Crisa, Crissa, were in reality the same name, may be explained from the use of the σ for the ρ, and the transposition of the letters. Compare other opinions on the subject, published by Fréret and Gédyon, in the Mem. de l'Ac. d. Inscr. 5. 164; Müller, Orchom. 495, and Prolegom. 275; Böckh. explic. Pind. 286.

³⁰ Polyb. 5. 27.

³¹ Liv. 32. 18; Strab. 9. 423.

³² The port is now shallow; Pocqueville, Voyages, 4. 41. Even Polybius states that there were shallows there in his time, 5. 103; comp. Thucyd. 2. 91.

³³ Concerning its three harbours, see Dicæarch. 52, and the description of the one, Odys. 13. 95.

³⁴ Ἀκαρνανία πᾶσα εὐλίμενος, Scyl. 30.

the ancient maritime town Cēniadæ³⁵, are now Misso-longhi, Natolico, and Galaxidi. The gulf of Ambracia³⁶, at whose mouth, near Actium, the fleet of the west secured to Augustus the empire of the Roman world, washes it on the north, and resembles one vast harbour³⁷, whilst the peninsula Leucas³⁸ forms its extreme boundary. But the queen of this island region, and mistress of the Ionian sea, was Corcyra, situate further north, at first the abode of the nautical Phæacians, a people at amity with, and even allied to the Greeks³⁹, but first introduced into Grecian history by the Corinthians. The Epirote regions beyond the gulf of Ambracia were not considered absolutely barbarian in the primitive ages, although the gulf was subsequently regarded as a natural boundary⁴⁰. The Ionian sea was at a very early period considered to belong to Greece⁴¹, though a Greek population did not visit the shores beyond it, those of Sicily, for instance, which afterwards gave its name to the sea that washes the Peloponnesus on the south⁴², till the migrations of the historical age.

b. The Interior.

§ 5. As the sea spread out its fairest charms to captivate the Greeks, so the mountains presented to them a no less attractive spectacle, in the bold and diversified forms they assumed in their abrupt com-

³⁵ Thucyd. 2. 102; Polyb. 4. 65.

³⁶ Scyl. 28; Dicæar. 30.

³⁷ Strab. 7. 325 *εὐλίμενος δὲ πᾶς*.

³⁸ An attempt was made to convert it into an island, by deepening the narrow channel by which it was divided from Acarnania, and through which the vessels were towed. (Thucyd. 3. 81.) Liv. 33. 17.

³⁹ Compare below, § 14. n. 39.

⁴⁰ Dicæarch. 24; comp. Ephorus ap. Strab. 8. 334.

⁴¹ On the use of the words *Ἰόνιος κόλπος* and *Ἀδριας*, see Strab. 7. 325, 326; comp. Mannert, Ital. 1. 12. 13.

⁴² Strab. 2. 123.

binations with the sea, whilst from the remotest ages, they have bid defiance to its storms, and exercised their power over the rivers that gush from their heights, at one time driving them with impetuosity into the valleys beneath, and at another drying up their channels¹.

From the vast mountain-belt, which, under the name of Hæmus, Scomios, and Scardos, (Scordus, Scodrus,) extends from Pontus to Istria, a chain of hills runs towards the south, with gradually decreasing summits, and stretches its arms towards the east and west. On the east side lay Macedonia, where none but the occupants of the seacoast were susceptible of a few of the social forms of their more cultivated neighbours², whilst the intermediate mountains were inhabited by barbarians. On the west, the extremity of Illyria harboured a small number of Greek colonies. The Grecian continent, properly so called, in the opinion of the people, and, according to geographers, consisted of two principal divisions, the Peloponnesus and the mainland without it³. At the northern confines of the latter, the chain of hills, which continues its course from the north, has received the name of Pindus⁴. The way that once led from Thessaly to the Athamanes⁵, is nearly five thousand feet above the level of the sea⁶, and there is a short but very

¹ For instance, the Attic Ilissus was in winter a wide and deep stream. Aristoph. Acharn. 380. In summer its bed was dry, and there was such a drought in the adjacent country, that vegetation could not thrive. Demosth. adv. Polycl. 1225. The stagnation of the rivers is said to be more frequent at the present day, because there is less wood upon the mountains. Dodwell, 1. 475. But a number of canals now draw off the waters of the Ilissus. See Clarke, Travels, 2. 2. 588.

² Comp. Müll. Dor. 1. 2, sqq.

³ Ἡ ξῆω ἡπειρος.

⁴ Herod. 1. 56; 7. 129; Strab. 9. 434.

⁵ The great Mezzovo is about 4,500 feet in height; other points nearly 2,000 feet higher. Holland, Travels, 202, sqq.

⁶ Liv. 32. 14.

troublesome road direct to Ambracia⁷. The declivities of mount Pindus on this side cannot, in the historical age, be considered strictly Grecian. Amongst the barbarian half-brethren of the Greeks that dwelt there, the Dolopes⁸, Threspotians, Molossians, etc., whose leaders it is true, till a very late age, bore Greek names⁹, and near whom, under mount Tomaros¹⁰, was situated one of the principal seats of the oldest national worship, Dodona, the germ of the nobler Greek character, which they originally possessed, never unfolded itself. Illyrian tribes, such as the Athamanes¹¹, had forced a way amongst them, and both races incorporated in such a manner as no longer to be distinguishable, as Agræans, Amphilochians, and Apodotians¹² penetrated into the ravines of Ætolia and Acarnania. They remained collectively rough sons of the mountains, whose disposition presented features little more attractive than their own rugged rocks and precipices, and what fable records of their rivers, Acheron, Cocytus, and Aornus¹³. Their southern neighbours, the Acarnanians, Ætolians, and Ozolian Locrians, through extensive intercourse, either blended with northern tribes, or shut in by them, manifested a correspondent disposition, and with the exception of the purer Acarnanians, became more and more estranged from their brethren in the east and south.

⁷ Liv. 15. et est iter a Gomphis Ambraciam, sicut impeditum et difficile, ita spatio perbreve.

⁸ Thucyd. 2. 102. The Achelous flowed from mount Pindus through their country. ⁹ Thucyd. 2. 80.

¹⁰ Holland, p. 145; Pocqueville, 1. ch. 11.

¹¹ Liv. 32. 14; comp. Polyb. 17. 5.

¹² Thucyd. 2. 102; comp. 2. 68. The Amphilochians were barbarians, except such as ἐλληνίσθησαν τὴν νῦν γλῶσσαν by the Ambraciots; comp. Liv. 32. 34; Strab. 10. 455, and Poppe, Thucyd. 2. 148.

¹³ Pausan. 1. 17. 5; 9. 30. 3; Plin. Hist. Nat. 41.

Five principal rivers flow from Pindus through the above described provinces, towards the west and south, from the Lacmon, its western continuation; the Aous, which falls into the sea at Apollonia¹⁴; the deep Aracthus¹⁵, which wash the walls of Ambracia, and falls into the Ambracian gulf¹⁶; the Inachus, which disembogues by Argos Amphilo-chium into the same gulf¹⁷; the Achelous, the natural boundary of Acarnania and Ætolia¹⁸; and the Ætolian Euenus¹⁹ from the southern foot of Pindus.

The Ceraunian mountains extend over Epirus westward, as the principal range of Pindus, and the northern confines towards the most remote of the half-Greek tribes; they terminate in the rugged headland, Acroceraunia²⁰, which projects and forms a barrier between the Ionian sea and the Adriatic gulf²¹, and is fraught with the same terrors for the seaman as the notorious promontories of Greece²². The opposite eminence is mount Elias in Leucas²³, three thousand feet in height, a range proceeding from the heights of the Callidromus²⁴, and continued in a southerly direction through Acarnania, to which must be added Ithaca, a mere cluster of mountain-peaks²⁵, and the black mountains of Cephallenia²⁶, four thousand feet in height. The northern boundary of that wild land of hill and forest, Ætolia²⁷, is

¹⁴ Hecataë. ap. Strab. 6. 271; 7. 316, and Steph. Byzan. *Λακμων*; comp. Herod. 9. 93. ¹⁵ Scyl. 22; Strab. 7. 316.

¹⁶ Liv. 43. 21.

¹⁷ Strab. 7. 325; Polyb. 22. 9.

¹⁸ Strab. 6. 271; 7. 326. 327, from Hecataëus.

¹⁹ Strab. 10. 450.

²⁰ Strab. 7. 321.

²¹ Plin. Hist. Nat. 3. 26.

²² Strab. 7. 316.

²³ Horat. Od. 1. 3. 20. and the comment.

²⁴ Holland, 59.

²⁵ Strab. 9. 428.

²⁶ Strab. 51; comp. Gell, Ithaca, and the view of it in Lechevalier, *Voyages d. la Troade*.

²⁷ Holland, 35.

formed by the Callidromus, which stretches from Pindus towards Acarnania²⁸; Parnassus and Cæta adjoin the lofty and inhospitable Corax²⁹, and at the mouth of the Euenus rises the majestic promontory Chalcis³⁰. The Ozolian Locris is no less rugged and precipitous; it did not allow of an intercourse with the more cultivated of the neighbouring tribes, and the road from Naupactus to Doris was seldom trodden³¹.

§ 6. In the east the Peneus descends from the back of the Pindus; the possession of its sources was contested by the Epirot Tymphæans and the Thessalians¹. The formation of the passage through which the waters of the Thessalian crater poured themselves into the sea², as well as of a particular bed for the Peneus, which was a consequence of it, belong to the age in which those violent and astonishing natural convulsions, to which we have already alluded, took place, and the Peneus afterwards visited the country with periodical inundations³. The objects that still meet the eye in its valley, are of the most surprising character. The lofty cone-shaped Meteora on the brow of the Pindus, between Gomphi and Tricca⁴, the vale of Tempe⁵, winding through verdant meads and between perpendicular precipices, and the silver waters of the Titaresius⁶ at its confluence with the

²⁸ Thucyd. 3. 97. 98. ²⁹ See n. 26.

³⁰ Strab. 9. 417; 10. 450; Liv. 36. 30; 37. 4; Appian Syr. 21.

³¹ Strab. 10. 451.

³² Thucyd. 3. 101; comp. Liv. ub. sup. and 37. 55.

¹ Strab. 7. 327.

² Herod. 7. 129; Strab. 9. 430; Baton ap. Athen. 14. 639. The lakes Bœbeis and Nessonis were considered to be remains of the inland lake. Strab. ub. sup.

³ Strab. 9. 430.

⁴ Holland, 231, sqq.

⁵ Ælian, V. H. 3. 1; comp. Barthélemy, Voyages du j. Anach. 3. 375; Bartholdy, Fragments, 112; Dodwell, 2. 109.

⁶ Homer Il. 2. 751; Strab. 9. 441.

Peneus, produce a sensation of mingled pleasure and awe. In the north, above the valley and the mouth of the Peneus, towers the snowy Olympus⁷, a vast eminence, which spreads its roots upon all sides, and extends to within a few thousand feet of the sea⁸, the natural bulwark of Greece, and the paternal guardian of the main tribe of the Greeks that once dwelt upon its sides, and gazed upon its summit as upon the abode of the gods. In ancient times, the chain of the Cambunian mountains⁹, which connects it with the Pindus, was included under the same denomination. The Peneus enters the sea between Olympus and the conical Ossa, which joins it on the south, and it is here that the vale of Tempe forms the principal entrance into ancient Greece, and might, in many parts, be blockaded with little trouble, and very few men¹⁰. At a short distance from this point there led a second road, over the heights and through the ravines of mount Olympus¹¹, which was, in the Macedonian times, beset with towers and fortresses; but the undaunted perseverance of the Romans opened another path in the same direction, and even a road for their elephants¹². A southern continuation of the chain, to which belong Olympus and Ossa¹³, is formed by Pelion; its base borders upon that of Ossa. Eastward, towards the last, extends the Othrys¹⁴, a central branch of the Pindus, as the southern frontier of the Thessalian valleys. Near the rocky bulwark Thaumacia, we advance from the

⁷ Ἀγανυψος Hom. Il. 1. 420. It is never wholly free from snow (Dodwell, 2. 105); but in summer its summit may be reached without difficulty. Holland, 303.

⁸ Liv. 44. 6.

⁹ As in Herod. 7. 129.

¹⁰ There were at one time four fortresses there, Liv. 44. 6; comp. Dodwell, 2. 3.

¹¹ See their description in Müll. Dor. 1. 20.

¹² Liv. 44. 5.

mountain gullies towards its northern declivity, and behold with delight and astonishment the fertile valley¹⁵ that winds through the Pindus and its subordinate branches. This valley slopes towards the sea on one side only, by Pheræ, in a south-easterly direction, and for that reason the Phthiotan Thebes, previous to the erection of Demetrias, was of great importance¹⁶ as controlling the intercourse between Pheræ, Larissa, and a part of Magnesia.

The branch of the Pindus southward of the Othrys, and proceeding in almost a parallel line with it towards the east, is formed by mount Œta. Callidromus¹⁷, a rock of five or six hundred feet in height, touches so closely upon the sea, that there is only a small space left, at one time scarcely broad enough to allow a single chariot to pass¹⁸. This was the second defile of northern Greece, known by the name of Thermopylæ. On the same line with this, as well as by Tempe, there were, in former ages, several paths which led over the mountains¹⁹, amongst which the Anopæa was known to the Persians²⁰, and which on several subsequent occasions rendered Thermopylæ untenable²¹. A wall near the Pylæ secured the Phocians from the attacks of the Thessalian cavalry; and Heraclea, forty stadia from Thermopylæ²², erected in the Peloponnesian war,

¹³ Herod. 7. 129.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Liv. 32. 4; comp. 36. 14.; Holland, 359.

¹⁶ Polyb. 5. 99. ¹⁷ Strab. 9. 428; Liv. 36. 15. 18. 19.

¹⁸ Holland, 374, sqq. did not find this to be the case, but the aspect of the country has entirely changed, in consequence of the sands which have been deposited there. See Barb. du Bocage analyse in Voyage du j. Anach. Atlas, p. 20, and Dodwell, 2. 68, sqq.

¹⁹ Paus. 2. 22. 5; concerning the two roads now in use, see Dodwell, 2. 74. 126.

²⁰ Herod. 7. 213. 216.

²¹ On the expedition of Brennus, see Pausan. 10. 21, sqq.

²² Thucyd. 3. 92; comp. Liv. 36. 15. 22.

might have proved an effectual defence under more favourable circumstances.

Still further towards the south are scattered some considerable eminences belonging to the great northern clusters, such as the towering Ocha in Eubœa²³. But the connecting height between Cœta and Cyl-lene, and the central point of the Grecian regions in general²⁴, is the mighty Parnassus, with its three soaring peaks²⁵. This vast mountain is rooted in the original seat of the Hellenic race in Doris, and from the extraordinary form of its caverns and grottoes, Corycion²⁶ and Castalia²⁷—the Phædriades²⁸ of Delphi, which rise two thousand feet above the level of the sea—its almost perpendicular rocks, and mural precipices, eight hundred feet in height—and the enthusiastic effects of its exhalations—was regarded as one of the wonders of nature, invested by the Greeks with a divine character, and marked out for the seat of the oracle and the sanctuary of the nation. Parnassus was the boundary of nations towards the east, parting off those Hellenic tribes in which the nobler faculties of humanity were still undeveloped. The valley of Phocis lay to the north, between its base and that of Cœta; besides a third defile, leading from Thessaly through the mountains of Phocis to the heart of Greece, and covered by the fortress of Elatea²⁹. The sacred way³⁰, set apart for the solemn processions and pilgrimages to Delphi, extended

²³ Strab. 10. 445; Steph. Byzan. *Κάρυστος*.

²⁴ The Greeks called it *ὄμφαλος γῆς*. Pindar Pyth. 4. 7. 134; 8. 85; Plato de Republ. 4. 427. C.; Strab. 8. 419, etc.

²⁵ Two only can be seen from Delphi, therefore *biceps Parnassus*.

²⁶ Herod. 8. 36; Paus. 10. 32; 5. 12. It is 330 feet in length, and 200 in breadth. Raikes, in Walpole's Memoirs, 310, sqq.

²⁷ Paus. 10. 8. 5.

²⁸ Holland, 393.

²⁹ Strab. 7. 327; 9. 418. 424.

³⁰ Herod. 6. 34.

along its base in a southerly direction, as well as the dangerous double pass ³¹ by Daulis to the Locrians in the north-east, and by Ambryssus to Bœotia, towards Lebadea. The Cirphis, separated from Parnassus by the bed of the Phæstus, is the extremity of the mountain towards the Crissæan bay ³².

The north-eastern portion of Bœotia is a valley shut in by mountains on every side; it contains the fertile plain of Orchomenus, watered by the Cephissus ³³, which flows from Parnassus, and runs into lake Copais. This lake did not, like the Thessalian, after the area of Greece had assumed a permanent form, retain a free outlet; its subterranean channels ³⁴ were stopped up by earthquakes, and many cities were ingulfed by the waters of the lake, which afterwards burst its embankments ³⁵. The south-east coast of Bœotia declines towards the Euripus, and is divided from Attica and Megaris by a chain of hills, which is connected with Parnassus, along the Corinthian gulf, by the considerable heights of the well-wooded Helicon, the parent of those fountains of the Muses, Hippocrene and Aganippe. The rugged Cithæron in the south, which contains Sphragidium ³⁶, the grotto of the nymphs and the springs of Asopus, opens various paths for traffic between Peloponnesus and northern Greece, besides

³¹ Σχιστὴ ὁδὸς Eurip. Phœn. 38; Sophocl. Œd. Tyr. 725; Paus. 10.5.2; likewise *τρίτοδος* Æschyl. apud. Schol. Soph. ub. sup., the road to Delphi being reckoned as the third. Now *τὰ στέγη*, Dodwell, 1. 194, sqq.

³² On the subject of Parnassus, see Müller, Orchom. 20, sqq., and the first exact description of Doris in his Dorians, 1. 35. 37. The road from Cirrha to Delphi is described by Liv. 42. 15.

³³ Müller, Orchom. 41, sqq.

³⁴ Now *Καταβοθρα*. See on Strab. 9. 406; Wheeler, Pococke, Dodwell, 1. 237, sqq.; Walpole's Mem. 305, sqq.; Müller, Orchom. 62, sqq., and Bœotia in Ersch und Gr. Encyclop.

³⁵ See § 1. n. 16; see Steph. Byz. *Ἀθήναι*, who states that some ruins became visible after Alexander had caused the waters of the lake to be drawn off.

³⁶ Paus. 9. 3. 5.

which the Athenians possessed the roads of Oropus and Tanagra³⁷ along the east coast, to which the Parnes and Brilessus extended from Cithæron.

As Bœotia, in spite of its striking position between three seas³⁸, was, both by means of its mountains and a profusion of the most luxuriant natural productions, as it were, confined within its own limits, so Attica, an inconsiderable and narrow strip of land, forming a sharp projection from the northern districts, poor of soil and sparingly watered³⁹, was driven by its native poverty to a maritime life. It is intersected by mountains; the Parnes joins Cithæron; to the south of this is Pentelicus, which is succeeded by Hymettus, whilst the terminating point is cape Sunium⁴⁰. No mountain in Greece offers a more beautiful prospect of the dark blue sea than Hymettus, the view towards the east extending as far as Chios⁴¹.

To the south of Bœotia lies Megaris, where mountain and sea unite with the utmost abruptness, and where, as at Corinth, but with a larger interval, there was one port to the east, Nisæa, and another to the west, Pagæ; the intermediate space is occupied by the Geraneia⁴², a rugged range of hills, in some parts as high as two thousand five hundred feet⁴³. The Oncia⁴⁴, separated from the Geraneia by the valley of the Isthmus, extend from Cenchreæ as far as the gulf of Corinth. The road from the Peloponnesus runs either over the Geraneia, along the Saronic

³⁷ See Append. ii.

³⁸ *Τριθάλαττος*, Strab. 9. 400.

³⁹ Concerning the Ilissus, see § 5. n. 1; comp. Dodwell, 1. 456; on the Cycloborus, see Schol. in Aristoph. Eq. 137.

⁴⁰ See in particular Dodwell, 2. 14; Müller, Attica in Ersch. und Gr. Encyclop. 6. 216.

⁴¹ Dodwell, 1. 485. 541.

⁴² See Append. iii.

⁴³ Holland, 419.

⁴⁴ See Append. iii.

gulf, by a long, narrow, and most precipitous path, the Scironian rocks⁴⁵, or by a circuit of three hours distance to Attica, over the back of the Geraneia, where banditti find secure haunts⁴⁶. Here it was customary to intercept the passage of hostile armies⁴⁷. To the south of this is the Isthmus, properly so called⁴⁸—a neck of land contracted to the inconsiderable breadth of forty stadia⁴⁹. It was there, near the harbour of Schœnus, that ships and merchandise were carried over⁵⁰; and there the Greeks built a wall to protect them against Xerxes⁵¹, which was afterwards several times restored⁵². This was joined by Acrocorinthus, calculated for a first-rate fortress⁵³, conveniently situated for closing the isthmus, and not only in modern days an advantageous position for commanding the surrounding country; it was looked upon as the third fetter of Greece, and like Ithome, accounted a horn by which the Peloponnesian ox might be secured⁵⁴.

§ 7. The Peloponnesus may be called a cluster of mountains; to the natural firmness and seclusion of this mountain bulwark of Greece¹, must be added a genuine Greek population, whereas the barbarians were at no period very distant from the higher ranges of the north. Tradition² recounted that the waters

⁴⁵ Strab. 9. 391; the Spartans closed it up in the Persian war, Herod. 8. 71; Hadrian widened it, Paus. 1. 44. 10; Pocqueville, 4. 59; but Clarke, in many parts of it, only found space enough for two horsemen, see Travels, 2. 2. 763.

⁴⁶ Now called Kake Skala, on account of the banditti that infest it, Clarke, 2. 2. 764. ⁴⁷ Thucyd. 1. 107.

⁴⁸ Thucyd. 4. 42. ⁴⁹ Strab. 7. 335.

⁵⁰ Διολκός Thucyd. 8. 7; Aristoph. Thesm. 654; Strab. 7. 335; 8. 380.

⁵¹ Herod. 8. 40. 71.

⁵² See Mannert, 8. 362.

⁵³ Clarke: The stupendous rock of Acrocorinthus, if properly fortified, would render all access to the Morea impracticable; and, as a fortress, it might be no less secure than that of Gibraltar.

⁵⁴ Polyb. 7. 11. 3; Plut. Arat. 50.

¹ Strab. 8. 334.

² Comp. § 1. n. 3.

had likewise here, at one time, prevailed over the land. The natural monuments by which this fact is attested, are the craters of the interior, the chasms and hollows of the mountains themselves, and the winding aspect of those districts that border on the sea, on that account anciently called "the hollow," "the vaulted³." At the time of Aristotle⁴ the soil was in many places marshy. The whole of the Peloponnesus was covered with hills, with the exception of a small portion of the sea coast. Their root Cyllene, the highest range in the Peloponnesus⁵, and the opposite eminence to Parnassus, occupies the north-eastern region of Arcadia, whence there runs a ridge of hills to Acrocorinthus, the extreme northern link of the Peloponnesian chain; to the north-east, crossing Phlius, it terminates in a point of land near Sicyon, whilst between the two is the pass of Phlius, leading to Sicyon and Corinth, which the Sicyonians once attempted to blockade, by means of the fortress of Thyameia⁶. That ridge likewise formed the northern boundary of Argolis, and the narrow but practicable road of Contoporceia led from Cleonæ to Argos⁷, through the ravine Tretos (the perforated)⁸, in which was the den of the Nemean lion⁹; parallel with this, there were two other paths, but both arduous, and only traversed by foot passengers¹⁰. By means of the expansion of Cyllene towards the west, Achaia is con-

³ Ἡ κοῖλη Ἑλίας, Strab. 8. 336; Laconia, Paus. 3. 1. 2; the territory of Argos, Soph. (Ed. Col. 378; and Schol.; comp. respecting the mountain Κοιλῶσσα near Phlius, Strab. 8. 382; Xenoph. Hell. 4. 8. 7.

⁴ Meteor. 1. 14.

⁵ Paus. 8. 17. 1.

⁶ Xenoph. Hell. 7. 2. 1. 23.

⁷ Paus. 2. 15. 4.

⁸ Hesiod. Theog. 331; κοιρανέων Τρητόιο; comp. χαραδραῖος Λέων, Zenob. 6. 39.

⁹ Pausan. 2. 15. 1; Polyb. 16. 16. 4; Schweighæus ad. Athen. 2. 43; Thucyd. 5. 58. ἡ κατὰ Νεμέαν ὁδός.

¹⁰ Thucyd. ub. sup.

tracted to a small coast-district, in which the mountains, in many places, approach so close to the sea that they leave nothing but a narrow cornice between, on which account the rivers of the country are mere torrents, the Crathis being the only one that constantly flows¹¹. A main road¹² leads from Arcadia to Patræ over the Panachaicon, which was in some parts covered with impenetrable forests¹³. Northern Elis partakes of the nature of a level country. The hilly barrier to the south of Cyllene, as far as Mantinea, has most obstinately resisted the forcible passage of the waters; water and land were frequently confounded together, so as to be almost undistinguishable; no river of consequence descends from these heights; the mountain torrents have formed themselves subterranean vents, and these not spacious ones; in the rainy season brooks swell into lakes, and the stoppage of a channel lays whole tracts of country under water. The Stympalus, which enters the bowels of the earth and reappears as the Erasinus in Argolis¹⁴, has channels of this description, and an irregular height of water, on which account it is at one time a river and at another a lake; of a similar character are the Olbius, near Pheneus¹⁵, which, in its course underground, is supposed to unite with the Ladon¹⁶, and sometimes inundated Pheneus¹⁷, and lastly, the

¹¹ Herod. 1. 145.

¹² Now called Makeleria from the many murders committed there, Dodwell, 1. 113.

¹³ Polyb. 5. 30.

¹⁴ Herod. 6. 76; Strab. 6. 275; 8. 371. 389; Paus. 8. 22. 3.

¹⁵ Theophrast. Hist. Nat. 3. 1. 5. 1.

¹⁶ Strab. 1. 60; 8. 389; Diodor. 15. 49; Plin. Hist. Nat. 4. 10; Paus. 8. 20. 1.

¹⁷ Paus. 8. 14. 1; Theoph. Hist. Plant. 5. 4; Plut. de sera numinis vindict. 9. 205.

Ophis, near Mantinea¹⁸. The slope declining from Cyllene to the south-west, which was crossed by the great road from the isthmus to Olympia, by Pheneus¹⁹ and Thalpusa, extends along the river Alpheus, which, after flowing through Pisatis, the central district of Elis, empties itself into the sea. The Gortinius and Erimanthus, and the Ladon²⁰, inferior to no river in the clearness of its waters, flow into it from the north-western part of Arcadia. The second principal river of the Peloponnesus, the Eurotas, rises near the source of the Alpheus. Both bear the traces of a struggle with unusual geological obstacles. They flow in common a short distance from their sources under the earth²¹; then separating, are obliged to force a passage through obstructing mountains. The bed of the Eurotas is said to have been originally formed by artificial means²².

Mount Lycæum, the opposite eminence to Cyllene, and of nearly equal elevation with it, commands a view of the greater part of the Peloponnese, and bounds the declivity above described to the south-west²³. This is joined westward by the Triphylian, and southward by the Messenian mountains, which, in the heights of Ithome, possess one of the strongest barriers of the Peloponnesus²⁴, and end in the promontory Acritas; and to the south-east by the Læonian Taygetus, which terminates in the headland Tænarus. A chain stretches eastward from Lycæum and forms the line of demarcation between Arcadia and Laconia. Besides these, there extend various

¹⁸ Concerning a lake near Mantinea, see Pausan. 8. 7. 1, and Pocqueville, 4. 157. ¹⁹ Müller, Dor. 1. 446.

²⁰ Pausan. 8. 20. 1; 8. 25. 7.

²¹ Pausan. 8. 44. 3; comp. 8. 54. 1. 2, and Polyb. 16. 17.

²² Paus. 3. 1. 2.

²³ Paus. 8. 35. 5.

²⁴ See § 6, n. 53.

ridges of bleak eminences, as connecting links between Cyllene, and the southern groups from north to south, for the most part stretching along the southern confines of Arcadia, like a strong natural wall, and ending in the point of Malea. The peninsula of Argolis is studded with eminences, by which it is naturally divided into districts; these heights, which possess little vegetation and few springs of water, end at the gulf of Hermione in rugged cliffs²⁵. The Erasinus was the only river of the country that constantly flowed; Neptune was said once in his anger to have dried up the beds of all the others²⁶.

The boundary between Argolis and Arcadia is marked by the mountains Artemisium and Parthenium. They were traversed by four passes; 1. through a country called Prinos; 2. a good broad path, furnished with steps, and therefore called Climax; 3. a narrow path along the Inachus, and then between the mountains called Artemisium; all these led towards Mantinea, whose high plain, also accessible in other directions, was, like Bœotia, the arena of rival armies; 4. by way of Hysiaë, through the Parthenium to Tegea²⁷. A very arduous path, called Anigræa²⁸, led along the coast of Lerna towards Laconia, to the district of Cynuria and the city of Thyrea; the possession of this was contested by Athens and Sparta, and it was accordingly the scene of frequent and sanguinary conflicts²⁹. The adjoining natural frontier of Arcadia was formed by the Par-

²⁵ See § 3, n. 12.

²⁶ Apollod. 2. 1. 4; Paus. 2. 15. 5; compare Dodwell, 2. ch. 6.

²⁷ Paus. 8. 6. 2; 8. 54. 4; Liv. 34. 26; compare on the position of Tegea at the foot of the Parthenium, Polyb. 4. 23; and Herod. 6. 105.

²⁸ Paus. 2. 38. 4.

²⁹ Herod. 1. 182; compare Thucyd. 5. 14. 41.

non³⁰; and it is here, as well as along the whole extent of its natural barrier, only to be approached by mountain passes³¹, such as led from Argos through the Parnon, and from Tegea to Sellasia and Caryæ³²; another ran through the land of Sciritis, towards Pellana³³; there was a way from Orestasium and another from Megalopolis by Phalasiæ to Belmina, in the valley of the Eurotas³⁴; the latter was more frequented as a military road³⁵. The agricultural portion of Laconia, a tract of land that emerged from the lake which afterwards became the Eurotas³⁶, is almost exclusively confined to the intermediate valley by two chains of hills³⁷; one to the east, almost entirely unknown, and the Taygetus to the west. The Taygetus, which towers in wild grandeur, is in height little inferior to the Lycæum, and is generally covered with snow till the end of May; it commands from its summit a view of the greatest part of the Peloponnesus³⁸, and may be seen from Zacynthus. It divides Laconia from Messenia, and was approached by two passes³⁹. The last is somewhat less rugged. The Pamisus, which only flows one hundred stadia, contains a greater body of water than any river in the Peloponnesus⁴⁰, and the Neda

³⁰ Paus. 2. 38. 7.

³¹ Δυσεμβολωτάτη ἡ Λακωνική. Xenoph. Hell. 6. 5. 24.

³² Xenoph. Hell. 6. 5. 25. This is mentioned by Diod. 15. 64, ἵσθην τὴν πορείαν: for an exact description of the same, consult Polyb. 2. 65; the direction towards Argolis, Plut. Cleom. 23; the Hermæ; then Paus. 2. 38. 7.

³³ The principal defile was ἐν Ἰῶ τῆς Σκιρίτιδος. Xenoph. Hell. 6. 5. 24.

³⁴ Paus. 3. 21. 3; 8. 35. 1; Plut. Cleom. 4.

³⁵ Plut. ub. sup. Here it would appear that the Eleans broke into Laconia; Diod. 15. 64.

³⁶ The idea of stagnation is indicated by the words Helos, Helia (Polyb. 15. 19), perhaps even Sellasia; compare Wess. ad. Diod. 15. 64; and below § 12, n. 15; Sparta, the daughter of Eurotas, is the land of seed.

³⁷ On the boundaries, see Plut. Agis, 8.

³⁸ Schol. Pind. Nem. 10. 114, over the whole Peloponnese.

³⁹ Müller, Dor. 2. 453. ⁴⁰ Strab. 8. 361.

only second to the Mæander in the windings of its course⁴¹, both water a delightful valley, besides which there are innumerable springs⁴²; whilst Ithome and Eira⁴³ are lofty without being steep. Triphylia, from its natural situation, must be regarded as belonging to Messenia, and Nestor once ruled over a tract of sea coast which bordered both countries.

c. Climate and Natural Productions.

§ 8. As few of the Grecian provinces were entirely cut off from the sea, so few of them were deprived of that incomparable brilliancy of sky, whose tints were reflected¹ in the no less transparent waters of the blue Archipelago, and which, from its influence on the Greeks, has proved that it has the most important effect on the national disposition, when a serene sky meets the gaze of the inhabitants. In the same manner, the greater part of the country enjoys the strengthening² and fertilizing north-west wind, which, consisting of the pure mountain air, and the nutritive sea-breeze, tempers³ the heat of the dog-days; and coolness may be found upon the heights, to which it ascends from the mountain craters; so that Herodotus with justice extols the happy mixture of the Grecian seasons⁴. Attica⁵ is pre-eminently favoured by its sky, for here it is most pure, and the eye may consequently see farther

⁴¹ Paus. 8. 41. 3.

⁴² Strab. 8. 366.

⁴³ Steph. Byzant. 'Ιπὰ from Rhianos.

¹ Clarke, 2. 2. 366.

² *Aquilo spissiora corpora reddit.* Celsus.

³ See Appendix. When the Etesian winds once ceased blowing, Aristæus was said to have preserved the country from the scorching heat. See Diod. 4. 82; Clem. Alex. Strom. 6. 630 B; Paris, 1629.

⁴ Herod. 3. 106.

⁵ On the εὐκρασία τῶν ὥρων there, vid. Plato. Tim. 24 C; Crit. 111 E; Epinom. 987 D. conf. Athen. 9. 372, and Casaub. 644.

over the sea⁶ than elsewhere. On the other hand, damp and foggy vapours hover over the valleys of Bœotia⁷ and Arcadia⁸, as well as over Eretria⁹. But the sky and atmosphere of Greece are far from being constant; the adjacent seas are agitated by frequent and violent tempests; rigorous winters and deep snows¹⁰ abruptly succeed the burning heats of summer, and hurricanes take the place of the north-west breeze. Few places were, therefore, stigmatized¹¹ as the permanent seats of epidemic influences. Corinth¹², now surrounded by a mass of deadly vapours, was once the haunt of pleasure; but the pestilent breath of a degenerating race for centuries infested this region, and impregnated the atmosphere with so much noxious matter, that malignant fevers now prevail over the whole of Greece; the plague finds ready admittance into many countries, and amongst others, Bœotia cannot be traversed without danger.

It will probably be sufficient here to enumerate a few of the chief natural productions of the country, without entering into a detailed enumeration of all the objects comprised under the heads of utility and pleasure. It is probable that through the greatest part of Greece, few productions were the spontaneous and free gifts of nature. Those tracts of country which were afterwards so fruitful, had first to be reclaimed from the lake and the morass; fertilizing materials brought to such as were placed on high and arid situations, and assiduous cultivation devoted

⁶ See § 6, n. 40.

⁷ Cic. de Fato. 9, but Dodwell, 1. 269, praises the air and water of Thebes.

⁸ Polyb. 4. 21.

⁹ Diog. Laert. 2. 133.

¹⁰ Dodwell, 1. 541; Holland, 1. 26. 27.

¹¹ Troezen; Isocrat. *Æginet.* 680. Lange's ed.; Plin. Hist. Nat. 31. 2; concerning Onchestus *πυρετός*, see Dicæarch, in Gronov. Thes. xi. 30.

¹² Clarke, 2. 2. 739; Pouqueville, 4. 170.

to all. Hence Herodotus and Thucydides mentioned it as one of the features of the Grecian character, "to produce excellence from labour"¹³. But nowhere was nature plunged in the torpor of inaction; she invited the natives to apply their hands to her stores, for if mere rocks were tilled, as was the case in Megaris¹⁴, human labour was never entirely unproductive.

Various descriptions of fish filled the Grecian bays and lakes, especially the pelamys, a species of tunny, coming in countless shoals through the Hellespont into the Ægean sea¹⁵. The Laconian purple-fish was inferior in excellence to none but the Phœnician¹⁶. The eel of lake Copais was formerly¹⁷, as it is still¹⁸, celebrated through the whole of Greece as an exquisite delicacy. The choicest fruits, fragrant and aromatic shrubs, herbs and flowers, laurels, myrtles, roses, and hyacinths¹⁹, grew upon Helicon, unmixed with venomous plants²⁰; forests of oak²¹, especially in the Peloponnese; cypresses and plane trees, which still attain an extraordinary height there²², once covered the mountains more thickly

¹³ Herod. 7. 102: τῇ Ἑλλάδι πενία μὲν αἰεὶ κοτε σύντροφός ἐστι, ἀρετὴ δὲ ἐπακτός ἐστι, ἀπὸ τε σοφίας κατειργασμένη καὶ νόμον ἰσχυροῦ; Thucyd. 1. 123; πάτριον γὰρ ἡμῖν, ἐκ τῶν πόνων τὰς ἀρετὰς κτᾶσθαι; compare Strab. 2. 127.

¹⁴ The Megarians were called πέτρας γεωργοῦντες; Isocrat. Symmach. 292. The Arcadian district of Azania was in great disrepute Ἀζάνεια κακά, Zenob. 2. 54; Diogen. 1. 24.

¹⁵ Aristot. Hist. An. 8. 30; Strabo, 6. 320; Plin. Hist. Nat. 9. 18; Athen. 7. 301 E. sqq.; 303 B.; 319 A. The ancients abound in passages relating to the tunny fishery, vid. Æschyl. Pers. 430; and Blomfield's citat.

¹⁶ Paus. 3. 21. 6.

¹⁷ Aristoph. Ach. 881. τερπινότατον τέμαχος ἀνθρώποις. Comp. Lysist. 36.

¹⁸ Raikes in Walpole's Memoirs, 305. Concerning the other kinds of fish as well as the birds, consult Kruse, Hellas, v. 1. 371—382.

¹⁹ See the enumeration of them in Kruse, 1. 346.

²⁰ Pausan. 9. 28. 1.

²¹ Paus. 8. 12. 1. On the importance of this kind of tree to ancient Hellas, see Creuser, Symb. 2. 476.

²² Dodwell, 1. ch. 4; Clarke, 2. 1. 198. On the subject of trees celebrated in antiquity, see Paus. 2. 28. 4.

and luxuriantly than at present²³, when barbarian hordes burn down part of a wood, to sow a single crop in the ground manured with its ashes²⁴. The bold huntsman seldom returned home without spoil; hares and deer were the objects of pursuit; and even wild boars were found in great numbers in the whole of Greece; bears²⁵, wolves, foxes, and even lions²⁶, were opposed to the enterprising vigour of their youth, who found faithful companions in their powerful dogs²⁷. The settler and the agriculturist had no want of useful domestic animals for food and labour; excellent horses were found in Thessaly and Bœotia, which likewise abounded in poultry²⁸; whilst mules²⁹, cattle, sheep, pigs, asses, and goats³⁰, were found in all the provinces. The less wooded eminences³¹ were covered with bees, and even at the present day, the Attic honey is the sweetest in the world³². In those parts where forests had been felled and marshes drained, thrived fruit trees³³, corn, and plantations, particularly the vine³⁴; these were all found in the

²³ This was even the opinion of Plato, Critias, 111. B. C.

²⁴ Pocquëville, 2. 86.

²⁵ On the Parnes, Taygetus, etc., Paus. 1. 32. 5; 3. 20. 5.

²⁶ Herod. 7. 126, and (from him?) Arist. Hist. An. 6. 28; 8. 27; names the Achelœus and the Nestus as the boundary line of the region infested by lions.

²⁷ Laconian, Arcadian, Argive, Locrian, Eretrian, Cretan, Molossian, dogs are named by Pollux, 5. 38. The last, according to the "Mythus," derived their origin from a brazen dog belonging to Hephæstus, 5. 39. On the excellent Laconian breed, see Aristot. Hist. An. 6. 21; 8. 27; Pind. ap. Ath. 1. 28 A; Frag. ap. Boeck. p. 599; Paus. 3.2 0. 5.

²⁸ Plato. Polit. 29 B. flocks of Thessalian geese and storks.

²⁹ For one of the most humane amongst all the popular decrees of Athens, as to a mule of eighty years old, consult Theophr. Hist. An. 6. 24. Elis only had no mules, Herod. 4. 30.

³⁰ Especially on the barren (Zenob. 1. 32; Diogen. 1. 30.) Scyros, Pind. ub. sup. ³¹ Plato. Crit. ub. sup.

³² Dodwell, 2. ch. 1.

³³ See Kruse, 1. 351.

³⁴ Wine, it is true, belongs rather to those islands of the Archipelago which afterwards became Grecian, but Homer Il. 2. 561. mentions ἀμπέλωντ' Εἰδανρον (conf. 2. 507. 537); on Parnassus there was a celebrated description

greatest profusion, and, consequently, of various descriptions in Thessaly³⁵; but the most fertile were Bœotia³⁶, the marshland of Greece, Sicyon³⁷, Messenia³⁸, Elis³⁹, Argos⁴⁰, Phlius, which last derives its name from the luxuriance of its soil⁴¹, the plain of Laconia⁴², and the island of Eubœa⁴³. The less fertile regions, such as Attica⁴⁴, produced fruit of other kinds, adapted to the peculiar nature of their soil; olives and figs, both of unusual excellence in Attica, as well as corn and wine, were amongst the most important natural productions of Greece. The herds found ample pasturage in those parts where the slopes of the mountains were not fitted for the objects of tillage, as in "Arcadia, with its many flocks⁴⁵." Without the Peloponnesus, particularly in the Attic Laurion, the earth con-

of vine, Eurip. Phœn. 236; on the cultivation of the vine in Laconia, see Theog. 875; in Messenia, Athen. 1. 29; about Thebes, 1. 33; on the island of Eubœa, Sophocl. in Schol. Eurip. Phœn. 238; conf. Schol. Antig. 1126; in Attica, Aristoph. Pac. 1162; Acarn. 183. 512. 995; see at large Athen. vol. i.; Æl. Var. Hist. 12. 31. In Æschyl. Suppl. 954, the king says to the Egyptian herald; you will here find brave men who do not drink barley-mead.

³⁵ Thucyd. 1. 2; Dionys. Hal. 1. 17; compare the response of the oracle in the Schol. Theocrit. 14. 48, *Γαίης μὲν πάσης τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἀργος ἄμεινον.*

³⁶ *Βοιωτοὶ μάλα πόνα δῆμον ἔχοντες*, Hom. Il. 5. 710; Thucyd. 1. 2; Dicæarchus on Thebes, *κάθ' ὅρους πᾶσα, χλωρά τε καὶ γεώλοφος, κηπώματα ἔχουσα πλεῖστα τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι πόλεων.* Gronov. Thes. 11. 25, comp. 28. For an enumeration of the articles of Bœotian produce, see Aristoph. Acar. 874, sqq. Concerning the heavy Bœotian wheat, see Theophrast. Hist. Plant. 8. 4. 5.

³⁷ An oracle advised those who wished to grow rich, to purchase all the land between Corinth and Sicyon, Schol. Aristoph. Av. 969; conf. Athen. 5. 219; Liv. 27. 31; Zenob. 3. 57; Clarke, 2. 2. 737; Dodw. 2. 37; Müller, Dor. 2. 72. 414. To that must probably be referred *ἀμᾶν Κορινθικὸν* Suid.

³⁸ Eurip. ap. Strab. 8. 366. In many parts it yielded thirty-fold. Sibthorp in Walpole's Mem. 60. The plain watered by the Pamisus was entitled "the blessed," Strab. 8. 361; Paus. 4. 34. 1.

³⁹ Agriculture prospered here; it was also celebrated for possessing the best byssus, Paus. 5. 5. 2.

⁴⁰ Aristot. Meteor. 1. 14.

⁴¹ Steph. Byz. Φλιούς, Ælian. V. H. 3. 41. *τὸ πολυκαρπεῖν-φλύειν.*

⁴² Amyclæ was *τόπος καλλιδενδρότατος καὶ καλλικαρπώτατος*, Polyb. 5. 19.

⁴³ Herod. 5. 31. *εὐδαίμων.*

⁴⁴ *Λεπτόγεως*, Thuc. 1. 2; *κρανάς*, Pind. Ol. 7. 51; 13. 52; Nem. 8. 9.

See the pleasing description of Aristophanes in Ath. 9. 372, B. sqq.

⁴⁵ *Εὔμηλος* Pind. Ol. 6. 169.

tained veins of silver ⁴⁶, besides rich shafts of copper and iron: marble and copper were especially found in the Eubœan Ocha ⁴⁷, and in the northern mountains of Argolis ⁴⁸, iron in Laconia ⁴⁹, marble near Carystus in Eubœa ³⁰, whilst the Attic Hymettus and Pentelicus ⁵¹ supplied the mechanic with implements and the artist with materials.

II. THE TRIBES OF GREECE.

a. The Pelasgians.

§ 9. The researches devoted to ascertaining what race was originally destined to inhabit the Grecian regions, which, in accordance with the physical peculiarities of the country, must necessarily have contained the germ of their subsequent nationality, move in a field which no one has yet attempted to explore, without more or less wandering from the right path. Formerly people supposed they could find firm footing for researches of this nature in the statements of the ancients, and accordingly endeavoured to gain over to their side a majority of citations, or with the authority of some leading name, to confute those who ventured to pronounce different opinions. But an unprejudiced and intelligent estimation of the sources of early Grecian history has now called forth as many doubts, as it has produced bold and ingenious conjectures. As the

⁴⁶ On the subject of the precious metals in general, consult Boeckh, *Pub. Econ.* 1. 6. On the silver mines of Laurion, see Boeckh in *Berl. Abhandl. Hist. Phil.* 1814-15.

⁴⁷ Strab. 9. 437; 10. 446. Hence Χαλκίς Steph. Byz. διὰ τὸ χαλκουργεῖα πρῶτον παρ' αὐτοῖς ὀφθῆναι. Conf. Schol. Ven. in Hom. Il. 10. 439, where the Cyclops are said to have first forged arms at the house of the Eubœan Euteuchius and Casaub. ad Ath. 899.

⁴⁹ Steph. Byz. Λακεδαίμ.

⁵⁰ Strab. 10. 446.

⁵¹ Strab. 9. 399.

⁴⁸ Müll. Dor. 1. 72.

vertical point of these opinions may be regarded that view, which enjoins us to behold in every thing that has been transmitted to us from the times of the Doric and Heraclid migration, nothing but a poetical fiction, and to treat that period as an age so entirely detached and included within itself, that no sort of connection can be established between it and the one by which it was succeeded¹. Ephorus commenced his history with that migration, but he was far from considering the primeval age as a period that had vanished, and left no memorial of its existence, and reverted, in various and numerous particulars, to the ancient time. No one, in fact, who proposes to investigate ancient Grecian history, can refuse entering upon the domain of poetry and fable, in order there to seek a footing for his operations. The testimony of the ancients, it cannot be denied, would present to us little more than their view of the preceding ages, did not a glance at the universal analogy of national history enable us to divest their accounts of the garb of fable, and to discover facts in them. Amongst the numerous poetico-historical accounts of the heroic ages of Greece, fragments of traditions, concerning its most ancient population, have been preserved, and from these it may be gathered that it was composed of various races. With the generalising spirit of his nation, Herodotus distinguishes the Pelasgians, above all the others, as a widely-extended race, and contrasts them as the stationary Attico-Ionic primitive tribe with the Hellenes, whom he calls the essentially migratory tribe, and the forefathers of the Dorians². His further account of the nationality of

¹ See Appendix iv. concerning Homer as an historical authority.

² Herod. i. 57.

the Pelasgians³; his loose mode of reasoning back from the so-called Tyrrhenian Pelasgians of his own time, to demonstrate the barbarian character of their language⁴, and his view of the conversion of the ancient Pelasgi of the mainland into Hellenes, have been for ages the guiding, or rather the misguiding, stars of investigation; and even at the present day it is not generally considered that the Father of History was the first to explore that path, and when there were no fruits of solid discovery to be reaped, advanced a conjecture, which, it is true, resulted from a spirit of judicious criticism, but was still unable to produce a full and substantial harvest. But the hypothesis, which is chiefly founded upon his assertion, that the Pelasgians were a race of barbarians distinct from the Hellenes in language, customs, and feelings, will scarcely meet with trustworthy advocates at the present day. In lieu of this, there has sprung up an abundant harvest of conjecture, partly reminding us of the ominous signification of the word "Pelasgi," which, without any great violence to etymology, may be referred to (πλάζειν) *to lead astray*; but without pausing to examine these fanciful hypotheses, I proceed to communicate the results of my own researches.

The scattered accounts of the ancients may, in the main features, be all condensed into two traditions, which are almost diametrically opposed to each other. The one which may be called the *mountain tradition*, and which was followed by Hesiod, Asius, Æschylus, and Ephorus, described the Pelasgians as stationary, and as autocthones in various quarters, of which Arcadia has the honour of being

³ Ibid. 2. 50, sqq.

⁴ Ibid. 1. 57.

regarded as the first⁵, where “the black earth upon Cyllene produced Pelasgus⁵,” together with which Thessaly was accounted one of the chief seats⁶. Argos was emphatically called Pelasgic⁷, and Attica and Achaia were said to have added a Hellenic element⁸ to their incontestably Pelasgic population; in Ion the fruitful Phlius counted a Pelasgus amongst its mythical princes⁹, and we may recognise Pelasgians in Bœotia in the Theban Cadmeans, however, these last may have been interwoven with the genealogy of the Hellenic heroes¹⁰. But according to the testimony of Strabo¹¹, Pelasgians were distributed over the whole of Greece, as well as without its limits, on the islands of Asia Minor and the coasts of the Hellespont, as far as Mycale¹², and according to Homer and Hesiod, around the seat of the oracle of Dodona¹³. The opposite tradition, however, describes the Pelasgians for the most part with the addition of Tyrrhenian, or as Pelasgic Tyrrhenians, as wandering hordes¹⁴, devoted to manual labour, as, for example, the construction of the Pelasgic citadel at Athens¹⁵, but more generally

⁵ Asius ap. Paus. 8. 1. 2; conf. 8. 4. 1; and Hesiod. and Ephor. 6; Strab. 5. 221; Apollod. 3. 8. 1; also Ἀρκάδες Πελασγοί in Herod. 1. 146; and Hygin. 225 on Pelasgus, the founder of the earliest temple of the Olympic Zeus.

⁶ Hom. Il. 2. 681; Dion. Hal. 1. 17; Strab. 5. 220.

⁷ Æschyl. Dan. 253, ὦ Πελασγία, and king Pelasgus in the same tragedy. Conf. Eunp. Orest. 684. 949; Phœn. 105. 263.

⁸ Herod. 7. 94; 8. 44; Strab. 8. 383.

⁹ Diod. 4. 72.

¹⁰ Strab. 9. 410, mentions as the former inhabitants of Bœotia, “Pelasgians and other barbarians.” The Minyans also bear the stamp of the Pelasgic character; conf. Müller, Orchom. 124. 243. 379.

¹¹ Strab. 5. 220, κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν ἐπεπόλασε.

¹² Herod. 7. 95; Ephor. and Menecrat. ap. Strab. 2. 221; 13. 621; conf. 12. 572; 13. 661; Plin. Hist. Nat. 5. 31.

¹³ Hom. Il. 16. 233; Hes. ap. Strab. 7. 327; conf. Strab. 5. 221. On their reputed descent from those of Arcadia, see Steph. Byz. Ἐφυρα, where, however, the genealogical series is greatly corrupted; comp. de la Nauze in the Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript. v. 7. 151, sqq. 4to. On the habitations of the Pelasgians in general, consult Kruse, Hellas, v. i. p. 404. 436.

¹⁴ Strab. 13. 621, πολὺ πλανοὺν δὲ καὶ ταχὺ τὸ ἔθνος πρὸς ἐπαναστάσεις.

¹⁵ Herodotus (1. 57; 6. 137.) does not explain how these Pelasgians were

as addicted to piracy¹⁶. This might, in some respects, be denominated the *coast-tradition*, if it were not altogether deficient in historical foundation and consistency. Ephorus¹⁷ makes a vain and fruitless approach to the genuine old tradition, when with but little critical discernment he makes bands of warriors migrate from the old Pelasgic Arcadians, like the Arcadian mercenaries of aftertimes. The account of Hellanicus concerning the Pelasgic migration to Italy¹⁸, seems to be better founded. The distinguishing marks of this opinion were the assigning them a homeless character, as, strictly speaking, it was not attempted to determine their mother country¹⁹, and the want of indigenous manners and customs, as well as the conversion of the Pelasgic name into an epithet derived from *πελαργός*, a stork²⁰, on account of the similarity in wandering—the employment of the word Tyrrhenian as a substantive—the confounding of the name with that of the people of Italy, and chiefly of the marauders that flocked from Adria in the Ionian sea—the transferring their ill-famed qualities to the old Pelasgic Tyrrhenians proper—and, finally, the extension of the appellation to seamen and pirates in general²¹. It is evident how this view was intended to apply to a single tribe of the ancient Pelasgians, and from being imperfectly understood, became afterwards extended to the whole. On the other hand, the former emanated from an old and natural

to be distinguished from the Athenians, who were themselves at one time Pelasgians (8. 44).

¹⁶ See append. v. on the subject of the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians.

¹⁷ Ap. Strab. 5. 221.

¹⁸ Dionys. Hal. 1. 18, sqq.

¹⁹ See my Roman Hist. 92, sqq.

²⁰ Strab. 5. 221; 8. 397. However, a very different explanation of the origin of the name is given in the Etym. M. and Bekker, Anecd. 299, *τελαργικόν*, viz. from the *σίνδονες* which they wore.

²¹ See append. v.

source; and in adhering to it we recognise in the Pelasgi an ancient and honourable race; ante-Hellenic, it is true, but distinguished from the Hellenes only in the political and social development of their age, not in the intrinsic constituents of character. Herodotus and others take a prejudiced view of the question when, reasoning back from the subsequent Tyrrhenian Pelasgi, as they were called, a forlorn handful of people, they call the ancient Pelasgians a rude and worthless race, their language barbarous, and their deities nameless²². Numerous traditionary accounts, of undoubted authenticity, describe them as a brave, moral, and honourable people, which was less a distinct stock and tribe, than a race united by a resemblance in manners and the forms of life, and a consistent interpretation of the natural appellation may be given without recurring to artificial means. The Pelasgians namely, or originally the Pelargians (for the latter name maintained itself in Attica²³), descended from the mountains into the plain, which, in the Peloponnesus²⁴ and Thessaly²⁵, was called Argos, and are indisputably established in the character of tillers of the earth; Pelasgus in Arcadia, said the tradition, taught men to bake bread²⁶. The ancient Pelasgic Buzyges yoked bulls to the plough²⁷; Pelasgians invented the goad for the purpose of driving the animals²⁸;

²² Herod. 1. 57; 2. 50.

²³ *πელαργικόν*, Aristoph. Av. 832, etc. But the play upon the word stork must not be overlooked here. See on Pelarge, n. 30. On the reading *Πελαργικέ*, Hom. Il. 16. 233, see Heyne, v. 7. p. 287.

²⁴ *Ἄργος*, strictly the plain near the citadel Larissa, Strab. 8. 37; *Ἀργόν*, a field in Arcadia, Paus. 8. 7. 1; compare on the Attic *Ἀργάδεις*, below, § 43, n. 29.

²⁵ These were pre-eminently called Pelasgic, Hom. Il. 2. 681; Strab. 8. 372; 5. 221; 9. 431. 443. Conf. Athen. 14. 639. concerning Pelasgus there, the draining of the plain, the festival Peloria. Hither may likewise be referred *Πίασος* Larissa's father (the exuberant, from the richness of the soil), Suid. *ἀθέμιστα*.

²⁶ Paus. 1. 14. 1.

²⁷ Etym. M. *βούζυγης*.

a (Pelasgic) Thessalian in Egypt taught the art of measuring land²⁹. The ancient Pelasgic gods were deities of the mountain and the field³⁰; their worship simple, rustic, and solemnized with bloodless offerings³¹; beside the plain (*Ἀργος*), a fortress called Larissa³² was generally erected; writing³³ and art³⁴ were not unknown to them. Homer called them the divine³⁵, and they occasionally appear as a better race that had succeeded barbarians³⁶. It assuredly required a total revolution in their ancient and well-regulated life, and the rise of new elements, foreign to their character, to impart to them the stamp of the rude and worthless. The manner in which this was effected will afterwards be explained with the further progress of the Hellenes.

b. The other Ante-Hellenic Tribes.

§ 10. The Lelegians, Carians, Curetians, and Cauconians are mentioned as contemporary with

²⁸ Etym. M. ἄκαινα and Bekker, Anecd. 357. To this head must be referred the statement in the Etym. M. Βούρα, that this was erected by the Centaur (κεντάω, ταῦρος) Hexadius, and that the βουστασία was there.

²⁹ Etym. M. ubi. sup.

³⁰ Demeter. Πελασγίς Paus. 2. 22. 2. Pelarge institutes her mysteries, Paus. 9. 25; 5. 6. See at large Creuzer, Symb. 4. 31, sqq.; compare on Zeus, 2. 472, sqq.; Müller, Dor. 1. 348. 354. 400. 402.

³¹ Concerning Cecrops, see Paus. 8. 2. 1. On the subject of Lycaon's reputed sacrifice of human victims, see Suidas Λυκάων, a statement of Nich. Damascenus, that differs from the common tradition, and, therefore, coincides with the above assertion.

³² Strab. 9. 440; 13. 621; comp. Steph. Byz. Λάρισσα. In addition to this, Ἀργόλας was the significant name of one of the founders of the Pelasgic citadel at Athens, Paus. 1. 28. 3; comp. Herod. 6. 137; Kruse, Hellas, v. 1. 438, sqq.

³³ Paus. 3. 20. 5; comp. Herod. 2. 51, on the Phallos-Hermæ.

³⁴ Diod. 3. 66.

³⁵ Il. 10. 429; Od. 19. 177.

³⁶ Aristot. in Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 397. Barbarians once dwelt in Arcadia; they were expelled by the subsequent (Pelasgic) Arcadians. According to Herod. 1. 173, barbarians first dwelt in Crete. According to Diodor. 5. 64—79, Eteocretæans; these were joined by the Pelasgians: now, Diodorus, it is true, ascribes every excellence to the Eteocretæans, but Homer's designation of the Pelasgians, as Δῖοι, leaves no doubt that the praise belongs to them.

the Pelasgians, and as considerable nations of the ante-Hellenic age ; some of these maintained themselves afterwards. Frequent mention of the Leleges occurs in the "*Politics*" of Aristotle ; they are represented as inhabiting Acarnania and Ætolia, Leucas, Bœotia, the Opuntian Locris, Megaris¹, as well as Laconia and Messenia², Eubœa³, and Asia Minor⁴.

The Carians were really indigenous on the islands and shores of the Archipelago⁵; but are not to be traced to the west coasts of the Grecian continent⁶. Both, however, belong to the maritime districts and islands, and were related⁷. The Leleges appear only as scattered hordes, destitute of every distinctive feature⁸; whilst a martial disposition⁹ and harsh pronunciation¹⁰ are the peculiar characteristics ascribed to the Carians: this, however, would only appear to apply to the nation under the aspect it subsequently assumed in Asia Minor¹¹. Both are enumerated

¹ Aristot. ap. Strab. 7. 321. 322; on Megaris, comp. Pausan. 1. 39. 5; 4. 36. 1.

² Paus. 3. 1. 1; 4. 1. 4.

³ Scymnus, 570.

⁴ Strab. 12. 610, sqq.; 13. 632. 635. 661.

⁵ Thucyd. 1. 8. is an authority for all.

⁶ According to Herod. 1. 171. the Carians proceeded from the islands to the mainland; the Carians, however, wished to be considered *autochthones*.

⁷ Herodot. 1. 171. Carians were at one time Lelegians; that is, those who subsequently constituted a distinct people, once formed part of the wandering hordes. Comp. Strab. 14. 661; Paus. 7. 2. 4. *Λέλεγες τοῦ Καρικοῦ μοῖρα*, and Philip. Theangel. ap. Ath. 6. 271. The Carians once employed the Lelegians as serfs. The Megarian tradition was different, Paus. 1. 39. 5; this contained a Car, and ten generations later an Egyptian Lelex; comp. 1. 44. 5.

⁸ *Μιγάδες* Aristot. ap. Strab. 7. 321; comp. *συλλεκτοὺς*, 322.

⁹ The crest, devices, and the management of the shield were considered their inventions; Herod. 1. 171. To this must be added their ancient custom of serving for pay; (Strab. 14. 662; and Ephor. Marx. 117.) Connected with their wanderings by sea, is perhaps the remark of Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. 306; thus they had invented *τὴν δι' ἀστέρων πρόγνωσιν*.

¹⁰ Hom. Il. 2. 867.; comp. Phil. ap. Strab. 14. 662.

¹¹ Aristoph. Av. particularly refers to this, when he says that the Carians lived on eminences.

among the Pelasgians¹², and sometimes mentioned *instead* of them¹³; but the latter are generally distinguished from them by an honorary epithet¹⁴. The name Curetes, like Pelasgians, was used in a twofold sense; it designated either a race of people, or a Cretan order of priests¹⁵; the first of which only is to be considered here. A mountain tribe of Ætolia¹⁶, they were driven by the Ætoli-ans, with whom they were at enmity¹⁷, and by the Thessalian Æolians to Acarnania¹⁸, and appear no longer as a distinct people. The Caucones dwelt in Messenia, Arcadia, Triphylia, and as far north as Dymæ¹⁹, and attempts have been made to discover the Caucones mentioned with the Pelasgians, the Lelegians, and the Carians in Homer, as neighbours of the Mariandynians²⁰ in Asia. Strabo reckons them amongst the barbarians, who were said to have inhabited Greece in the most remote ages; however the Caucones, as the followers of Nestor, were entitled to be looked upon as Grecian²¹, although their name existed but a short time in the historical age; this, and the circum-

¹² Hom. Il. 10. 428. 429. Ninoc, in Caria, is called, in Steph. Byzan., *Νινόη-κτισθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῶν Πελασγῶν Αελέγων*.

¹³ The Pelasgians on the Carian Chersonese, Diod. 5. 61, must be looked upon as Carians; on the contrary, Cornel. Nep. Miltiad. 2. has Carians, instead of Tyrrhenian Pelasgians, in Lemnos.

¹⁴ *Δῖοι*, Hom. ub. sup.; Strabo. 13. 610.

¹⁵ Strab. 10. 466, sqq.; Höckh. Creta. 1. 198, sqq.

¹⁶ Archemacus, the Eubœan, Strab. 9. 465, considers Eubœan Chalcis their first dwelling-place, and makes them the "shorn in front," afterwards contend with the "unshorn," the Acarnanians. The etymological point is obvious; however the Abantes *ὑπιθεν κομόωντες*, Il. 2. 542, and the Ætolian mountain Chalcis, offered fallacious grounds for the assumption.

¹⁷ Hom. Il. 9. 525, sqq.

¹⁸ Strab. 10. 465.

¹⁹ Herodot. 8. 148; Strab. 8. 342. 345. 387; Paus. 4. 1. 4; 4. 26. 2.

²⁰ Strab. 8. 345; 12. 542. 544.

²¹ The catalogue of ships does not record them, it is true; but in the Il. 10. 490, they are Trojan auxiliaries; the Odys. 3. 366, and Herodot. 1. 147, call the Neleids Caucones. It is worthy of remark that Caucon, Paus. 4. 1. 4; 4. 27. 4, is the transplanter of the Eleusinian mysteries into Messenia.

stance of their being mentioned as an Asiatic people, may have determined the judgment of Strabo.

The Carians alone maintained their footing as a distinct tribe; their connection with Greece was exceedingly remote, and they indirectly promoted the degradation of the Pelasgic name, which was confounded with their own.

Amongst the tribes ascribed to the earliest ages, and characterised as non-Hellenic, the Thessalian *Æmonians*²², the *Bœotian Pronastæ*²³, and *Hec-tenes*²⁴, are mere sounds; of the *Bœotian Aones*, *Temmices*, and *Hyantes*²⁵, nothing is known but the name; the *Centaurs*²⁶, with their inseparable attendants, the *Lapithæ*²⁷, partake far more of the mythical than the historical character, as well as the *Phlegyæ*, whom it is difficult to distinguish from the *Lapithæ*²⁸, but between whom and the *Orchomenian Minyans* an affinity has been traced²⁹; the *Dryopians*³⁰ had a decidedly historical existence in Thessaly and the adjacent countries, and may be discovered scattered till a late date over *Argolis*, the island of *Eubœa*, and *Cythnus*³¹.

In enquiring into the relation in which these, and the tribes before mentioned, stood to the *Pelasgians*, as the principal people, it must be observed, that the ancient national denominations are applied

²² Pind. Nem. 4. 91.

²³ Steph. Byz. *Προνάσαι*.

²⁴ Paus. 9. 5. 1; Lycophron. 1. 212. Comp. Müller, *Bœotia*, in Ersch. und Gr. Encyclop. 6. 261.

²⁵ Strab. 7. 321.

²⁶ *Ἀργίων τι φῶλον*, Strab. 9. 439.

²⁷ Buttman (üb. d. *Minyæ*. Berl. Abhand. 1820, p. 197, sqq.) opposes them as the builders of cities (the stone-persuading) to the *Centaurs*, as nomad cavalry.

²⁸ See the examples in Müller, *Orchom.* 248, sqq.

²⁹ Ibid. 134. Compare the sagacious combination of Buttmann ubi sup.

198, sqq. ³⁰ "Barbarians," Strab. 7. 321.

³¹ Herod. 8. 43; 46. 73; Thucyd. 7. 57; comp. Müller's *Dor.* 1. 41, sqq.

not only to tribes of a common origin, but also to hordes of mixed extraction, united by a similarity of manners and customs. The Aones, Temmices, Hyantes, Dryopes, Curetes, and others, must apparently be considered as separate races, whilst the Pelasgians themselves, the Leleges, Carians, etc., can only be regarded as mixed hordes, or even tribes, or as distinguishable by a common designation through certain external points of resemblance. It is certain that amongst the earliest population of Greece, tribes originally associated by an affinity of race, were not less numerous than in later ages; and the same may be observed of others existing separate and apart from each other. Still they were not destitute of one great national bond of union; for originally a great and widely ramified family of nations, from which the Hellenes, as the noblest offspring, subsequently issued, appears to have been spread over the whole of the region which extended from Crete and Caria along the west coast of Asia, including the Troad, as far as the Hellespont, then through southern Thrace and eastern Macedonia, over the Pindus and through Epirus as far as Acroceraunia, and none of the tribes above enumerated can be called decidedly barbarian. However, the extension of territory, and the difference in their mode of life, arising from natural causes, or at an early period resulting from political development, could not fail to render the bond by which they were united an extremely feeble one, and to prevent any decided or uniform features from becoming the characteristics of the whole mass. It must be considered as a complete misapprehension, and an unsuccessful attempt to simplify the ancient

population, when the Pelasgians are represented as the mother tribe, and their name is employed as the general designation; the Pelasgians are specified by Homer individually, and together with them he enumerates other tribes; therefore the principle of common nationality was seated above all these in a higher and unknown element. But if, according to the above, the Pelasgians are not to be considered as a single national tribe, but their name is to be regarded as the denomination for several nations of homogeneous political character, under which, however, might be comprehended distinct tribes, with their own peculiar names, then it becomes necessary to consider the relation of the races or tribes differently named to the Pelasgians, that is to say, of those who, like them, were distinguished by a collective appellation, from another point of view. Thus from the Pelasgians, as the stationary inhabitants and tillers of the plains, are contradistinguished the Lelegians and the Carians as the wandering inhabitants of the islands and coasts; in general, however, these and the other tribes stood in nearly the same relation to the Pelasgians as afterwards the ruder mountain tribes did to the Hellenes; but whilst on the one hand tradition converted many of them, like the Phlegyæ and the Centaurs into impious robbers, it on the other, represented the Centaur Chiron as a being of a more exalted order³².

Finally, mention must be made of the mythical

³² With the more familiar allusions to Chiron, compare a quotation in the *Titanomachia*, 6. Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. 306, viz. that he first taught justice and the fear of the gods, *δείξας ὄρκον καὶ θυσίας καὶ σχήματα Ὀλύμπου*. His daughter Hippo teaches natural history, *φυσικὴν θεωρίαν, τὴν πατρίων ἐπιστήμην*.

Thracians. Thracians several times occur in the ancient legends; occasionally as associates of the Pelasgians³³, and with attributes not barbarian, as for instance when Eumolpus is represented as initiating into the Eleusinian mysteries³⁴, the worship of the muses by Orpheus, Musæus, Thamyras³⁵, and the Pierians generally³⁶, the consecration of Helicon³⁷, and the adoration of Dionysus³⁸, with which deity they appear to have been connected much in the same manner, as the Hyperboreans were with Apollo. Such attributes as those from which Pausanias³⁹ infers that the Thracians must have been more cultivated than the Macedonians, do not apply to the barbarian Thracians of a later age. Those mythical Thracians extended from Pieria and Tempe⁴⁰, to the central provinces of Greece, Phocis⁴¹, and Delphi⁴², Bœotia⁴³, Attica⁴⁴, and Eubœa⁴⁵. The mythical opinion, however, does not seem to have established any boundary in the north; their neighbours were called the Hippomolgi, the most just of nations⁴⁶; but in all probability it did not extend beyond the country contiguous to Troy, amongst whose allies Thra-

³³ Both fight against the Bœotians. Ephor. ap. Strab. 9; Marx. 128; from which and from the Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 134. the statement of Diodor. (Fragm. vol. 4. 15. Bipont) that Thracians had expelled the Minyans, must be rectified.

³⁴ Apollodor. 2. 5. 11.; and Heyne, 337, sqq.; Creuzer, Symb. 2. 285; 4. 341.

³⁵ Strab. 9. 410; 10. 471; Paus. 9. 30; 3—5, etc. See Creuzer, Symb. 2. 284. 294; 3. 151. sqq.; Müll. Orchom. 379—390; Dor. 1. 9.

³⁶ Heyne de Musis, C. Gott. 8. 32, sqq.

³⁷ Strab. 9. 410.

³⁸ Müller's Orchom. 382. Comp. Creuzer, Symb. 3. 149, sqq.

³⁹ Paus. 9. 29. 2.

⁴⁰ Steph. Byz. Ἀλώϊον.

⁴¹ Thucyd. 2. 29; Paus. 1. 41. 8.

⁴² Θρακίδαι still at the time of Philolemus, Diod. 16. 24.

⁴³ Thucyd. 2. 29; Apollod. 1. 7. 4; Strab. 9. 401, sqq. etc.

⁴⁴ Strab. 7. 321, etc.

⁴⁵ The Abantes, Aristot. ap. Strab. 9. 445.

⁴⁶ Hom. Il. 3. 5. 6. The Σίντιες ἀγριόφωνοι, Odyss. 8. 394, are virtually separated from them by the epithet.

cians are commemorated as a single tribe⁴⁷, but this cannot lead us into error, with regard to the further import of the name, any more than in the case of the Germanic Suevi⁴⁸, or the old Italian Opici. Hence, whether we make the Thracians in Greece, or those about the Troad, the point from which we start, it is evident that the whole extent of country, situate between the two extremes southward as far as the foot of Olympus, and consequently including Macedonia, which was not yet distinguished by a particular appellation, was considered Thracian. Whenever the name arose, or from whatever tribe it may have been taken, the transferring of it from the Hellenic Thracians, to those around Troas, or vice versâ, could not have taken place without a certain uniformity, at least as far as concerned external indications; and even supposing the intermediate maritime districts were called Thracian, less weight is perhaps to be attached to the conjecture, that through ignorance the designation had been continued from the two extremes to the centre, than to what has been observed above, namely, that a large family of nations in the main features resembling each other, really dwelt along the shores of the Archipelago over the extent of territory specified above. This continuity of the nations of the coasts, however, seems to have been broken by the barbarians who pressed forward from the north of Thrace, in the same manner as the barbarians forced themselves amongst the Hellenic tribes on the Pindus. The remains of that old Thracian stock are perceptible

⁴⁷ Hom. Il. 2. 844. 845.

⁴⁸ Strab. 7. 321; 10. 471.

in the "bilinguous" barbarians near the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians of the southern coast of Thrace⁴⁹, the Briges in the Macedonian mountains with the gardens of Midas⁵⁰, and the non-Illyrian Macedonians of the coasts themselves, who are on that account not unaptly denominated by Justin⁵¹, Pelasgians, in the vague acceptation of the word. These old Thracian tribes, allied to the aboriginal inhabitants of Hellas, although on account of certain peculiarities distinguished by particular names, perhaps issued from the ancient Pieria in the north near Olympus; and penetrated into the heart of Thessaly, and still farther south. Like the Pelasgians, they afterwards merged in the Hellenes, without retaining the slightest trace of a foreign origin. But inasmuch as we must suppose the Hellenes to have been but little acquainted with the north of Thrace, there appear greater truth and consistency in the mythical opinion, which, with the advancing of the barbarian Thracians, in lieu of the legends of the mystic wisdom of an Abaris, Zamolxis, and the Hyperboreans, placed their primitive home still farther in the remote north, than in the seemingly historical opinion which pretended to discover on the Strymon, or amongst the Pierians about the Pangæus⁵², that which belonged to the great and but vaguely defined race, and endeavoured to identify the mythical Nysa, much in the same manner as various Pelasgic Larissas in Campania, etc. Even the assertion of

⁴⁹ Thucyd. 4. 109.

⁵⁰ Herod. 8. 138.

⁵¹ Justin, 7. 1.

⁵² E. g. Suidas *Θάμυρις* ἐξ 'Ηδωνῶν — οἱ δὲ ἀπ' 'Οδρύσσης.

⁵³ See an example in Diodor. 3. 64. Comp. Prideaux on the Marm. Oxon. 343, sqq.

Herodotus⁵⁴, that the Thracians were the most numerous people after the Indians, rather applies to the mythical than to the historical Thracians.

c. The Foreign Settlers.

§ 11. Closely connected with the preceding discussion, is the question, in what light are to be regarded the accounts of the strangers, Danaus, Cecrops, Cadmus, Pelops, etc. who were asserted to have come from Egypt, Phœnicia, and Asia Minor, and of what nature was their influence on Grecian society¹? Having shown that the Pelasgians, even when considered with reference to their intrinsic character and native manners, by no means deserved the appellation of Barbarians, which has been applied to them, I next proceed to enquire, whether the noble attributes of humanity, that were found amongst them, were of indigenous growth, or engrafted on the native stock from foreign sources; a question which, after the attempted vindication of that people, becomes the more important; and the answer to which necessarily involves the character of the Hellenes. In the indispensable preliminary enquiry, whether the accounts of those strangers rest upon an historical foundation or not, it is very far from my design, after the indescribable prodigality of research and combination in this field, to attempt a gleaning of scattered notices concerning the individual strangers, their country, and age: historical criticism

⁵⁴ Herod. 5. 3.

¹ Indirectly he even testifies against himself, l. 60: — ἐπει γε ἀπεκρίθη ἐκ παλαιτέρου τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ ἔθνεος τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐὼν καὶ δεξιώτερον καὶ εὐθηέστερον ἡλιθίου ἀπηλλαγμένον μᾶλλον.

may assume as valid the possibility, and even the probability of what has been recorded, which the historians probably derived from the poets of earlier ages, and may even support it by analogy. Greece, from its situation, presented itself to the east under an aspect too inviting, and many of the eastern nations prove themselves in the earlier ages, to have been too active and enterprising, for the neighbouring land in Europe to have remained secluded and unknown. But of more importance to this investigation than the fact itself, are the consequences it produced; and it is undeniable that the latter in their turn throw light upon the former. We therefore pass over the accounts of Herodotus who was so immoderately influenced by his disposition to refer every thing to foreigners, as well as those of his successors, and enquire, what traces of actual settlements of this description have been preserved in the most important manifestations of Grecian nationality. The most pregnant, and at the same time the profoundest evidence of original nationality must be drawn from its most authentic monument—language. The language of the Greeks, considered under its general aspect, and examined according to its inherent vital principle, instead of being tried by the false standard of single and arbitrarily selected words, bears pre-eminent marks of a genuine primitive origin, and the strength of pure and unmixed growth, resulting from it, so that the subsequent external accessions, by the side of a stock of words naturally and regularly derived from simple roots, appear insulated, and incapable of transfusing themselves into the inner essence and genius of the language.

Ancient names of places and persons of apparently foreign formation, are to be explained from the analogy of an earlier, harsher, and rougher mode of inflection, and ascribed to the parent stem of the language²; with regard to its similarity amongst the single tribes, which in consequence of a community of origin may be traced even in the modifications of the dialects, Homer's testimony³, and the inference to be drawn from his emphatical mention of the harsh language of the Carians and Sintians⁴, are deserving of particular attention. How can it be supposed, that either the simple elements of language, or a supply of already matured forms, could have been brought with them by the Orientals, and that they afterwards prevailed to such an extent as to supplant an anterior language in Greece? Or how can the resemblance between certain roots and forms be extended to universal affinity. The arguments drawn from the remaining modifications of moral and social life are less conclusive; for none of these are so closely interwoven with nationality in all its bearings as language, nor are they in their turn equally liable to be manifested in it. At the same time that it is impossible not to perceive a connection between the religion of the east and that of the Greeks in the relics of one primeval contemplation of the divine principle in nature, propitiated by a pure and innocent worship; it must be confessed that these elements are on the one side so intellectual

² Interpretation from the oriental languages is only admissible with a very limited number. See in particular the attempts of Buttmann in the dissertation: On the Mythical connection between Greece and Asia, in Berl. Abh. 1818 and 1819, p. 215, sqq. and on the Minyæ, *ibid.* 1820 and 1821, p. 206.

³ Il. 4. 437. The Troades had not *ἰα γῆρυς*, 'Ἀλλὰ γλῶσσ' ἐμέμικτο.

⁴ Il. 2. 867; Od. 8. 294.

and so general, that floating as they do above the characteristic peculiarities of single nations, they do not require to be furnished with their stamp and impress in order to propagate themselves in the minds of the people. Thus it was that chivalric feeling, as one great universal principle, associated the nations of Europe and Asia in the middle ages. On the other hand, indeed, it appears, that contemporaneously with the predominant religious system of the Greeks, which attained its popular development at a later period, there existed foreign forms of worship, to which peculiar sacerdotal races were annexed, wherein more than mere accidental and vaguely defined sketches of the oriental principle may be perceived: still they remained foreign: the barrier between them and the Grecian mind was not removed: they obtained a footing, indeed, but on a narrow and circumscribed ground, and were resolved into the Grecian worship through the force of its inherent character, which they were incapable of changing. It therefore follows, that although Greece received various incitements from without, and more especially in Crete, we perceive the native principle of advancement to have been actively and vigorously promoted by such impulses, still the main source of the Grecian character did not suffer itself to be troubled by the accession of foreign streams, but either interpenetrated them with its own crystal transparency, or proudly glided over them, like the Titaresius over the Peneus, but nowhere was any element of popular life in Greece perverted or endangered by oriental strangers. Its principal elements do not appear as a fortuitous and heterogeneous

mass, but as the native product of the soil, constituting an organic whole knit together by internal strength, and as a youthful and healthful body, which confirms its descent from a vigorous parent by the strength and flexibility of its members. Those fundamental ingredients must have originated in the time of the Pelasgians; their entire development in the Hellenic age was only a continuation from the same commencement, and the Hellenic principle cannot therefore be regarded as a new and strange element, essentially different from, and inimical to the Pelasgic.

d. The Hellenes of the Heroic Age.

§ 12. In enquiring how the Pelasgic principle was supplanted by a new one arising out of it, viz. the Hellenic, the history of the name Hellenes is distinct from, and subsequent to an account of that state of things, which though contrasted with the Pelasgic period, was not entitled Hellenic till afterwards. Postponing the consideration of the name, we therefore pass on to the fact itself, viz. that the Pelasgians were superseded by the Hellenes.

The commencement of the history of the Hellenic race, and of its predominance over the Pelasgians, may be compared to the rise of contentious huntsmen, robbers, and warriors amongst peaceful husbandmen; or, once more to use a common but appropriate analogy, the growing political ascendancy of chivalric races of heroes and princes, with military retinues, in the midst of free rural communities, or such, at least, as were only subject to the natural authority of their hereditary chieftains.

The genealogical poetry has placed Deucalion, the reputed father of the Hellenes, in Thessaly¹; and thither must be referred the origin of that system. Thessaly is described, in Grecian history generally, as the land of horsebreeding, with which oligarchy was for a long time united². The employment of chariots in battle is the distinctive feature of the heroic mode of warfare, the glory of which at length sunk before the overpowering Doric Hoplites. The "horserearing Argos³," originally pointing to Thessaly as the cradle of the heroic system, has obtained a more general⁴, almost symbolical import, which holds good in the majority of those passages in Homer in which it is mentioned⁵. To that mode of fighting may be added what the natural man most vividly conceives, the external phenomena of dress and armour. How this chivalry was formed, is indicated by the tradition, that the heroes Actæon, Achilles, etc., were educated at the foot of Pelion, by Chiron, the wisest of the Centaurs⁶. In the same manner, as the tradition represents Pelasgians as proceeding from the Peloponnesus into Thessaly⁷, it sends forth from thence, for the purpose of remodelling the Pelasgic political system, into most of the provinces in and without the Peloponnesus, chivalric princes, declared descendants of Hellen, by whose name the origin of

¹ See below, n. 18.

² Hence Aristot. Pol. 6. 4. 3, classes ἱππασίμος χώρα in general and oligarchy together. Comp. §. 30, n. 54.

³ Ἀργος ἱππόβορον Hom. Il. 2. 287; 3. 75; 2. 58, etc.

⁴ See Odyss. 4. 562; where this is transferred to the Peloponnesian Argos; Pind. Isthm. 7. 17. Ἀργος ἵππιον, comp. Eurip. Orest. 1639.

⁵ So far it is with justice, that Strabo, 8. 370, says of Homer, κοινῶς εἶρηκε.

⁶ Apollod. 3. 4. 4; 3. 16. 6; Apollon. Rhod. 1. 555, etc. Concerning the lance of Peleus, see Hom. Il. 16. 143. In Steph. Byz. Ἑλλάς, Hellen, is not the son of Deucalion, but of Phthius and Chrysippe, both very significant names.

⁷ Dion. Hal. 1. 17.

the new order of things was designated. These it then represented as one family, with extensive ramifications; and whenever a prince, sprung from one of these, obtained the government of a country, the conversion of the Pelasgic into the Hellenic system seems to have been accomplished. Thucydides⁸ perceives in the Hellenes wandering military hordes. This opinion does not appear altogether destitute of foundation, and is supported by analogies from later ages, as the mercenary character of the Carians, the wandering Etruscan bands under Coëles Vibenna and Mastarna (Servius Tullius)⁹, and that which is less remote, and in reality produced changes equally extensive with those in the Mythus, viz., the Doric expedition. Still the extension of a principle is implied, by the significant traditions of the expeditions of single heroes, unaccompanied by their tribes; as Hercules does not take with him, on his adventures, a people sprung from the same race as himself, but is either represented as attended by volunteers¹⁰, or warriors of the country where he happened to be at the time¹¹, or as fighting and suffering alone. This chivalric royalty, under which footsoldiers, unknightly vassals, are led by a hero mounted on his chariot, is beheld in its perfection in the Homeric poems. But Homer did not employ the name Hellenes as a general denomination, although it afterwards became one¹²; but

⁸ Thucyd. 1. 3.

⁹ See my Roman Hist. 162.

¹⁰ Apollod. 2. 5. 8.

¹¹ As in Pind. Ol. 10. 51; comp. Apollod. 2. 7. 2. Thus Peleus took the town of Iolcus *μόνος ἀνευ στρατιάς*, Pind. N. 3. 59.

¹² "Ἑλλήνες, Il. 2. 684, are the followers of Achilles; see Thucyd. 1. 3. The genuineness of this verse is not wholly unsuspected; 2. 530, has *Πανέλληνες*; but this one is confessedly spurious. Comp. Strab. 8. 370; and Heyne ad Hom. vol. 4. p. 310. 364.

instead of this he borrows from the bands of the commander-in-chief the names of Danaans and Argives; however, the appellation Achæans as the conjoint designation of the majority of the Peloponnesian nations, and of a particular Thessalian race, was more comprehensive¹³, and must be looked upon as an intermediate denomination between Pelasgians and Hellenes; which explains how the latter name might still be but little diffused, after the former had ceased to be as widely extended as before.

How then are we to characterise the name and race of the Hellenes; and how did the former become extended into a designation for common nationality, after the Pelasgians had become separated from, and opposed to, the Hellenes?

Hellas was the original name of a province in Thessaly, which bordered upon the plain of Pelasgic Argos, where, towards Thebes, the latter declined towards the Pagasæan gulf, and upon the district of Phthia¹⁴, and was afterwards included in Phthiotis. The name Hellenes was at first only applied to the inhabitants of that country, the Myrmidons, the followers of Achilles to Troy, and

¹³ Thessalian Achæans, Hom. Il. 2. 684. Comp. Herod. 7. 196. 197; Thuc. 4. 78; Dion. Hal. 1. 17; Liv. 33. 32. They belonged to the province of Achilles. But that the name was indigenous in the Peloponnesus is proved by its continuance amongst the subsequent Achæans. See an attempt to trace the causes of the extension of the name in Strab. 8. 365; the Achæans accompanied Pelops to the Peloponnesus, inhabited Laconia, etc.; and by reason of their excellence, the Peloponnesus, which had been before called Argos, was denominated the Achæan Argos. Concerning Achæus, see 8. 383. Comp. Heyne, Hom. v. 4. p. 367. 368.

¹⁴ Hom. Il. 2. 681, sqq.; 9. 447. 474; Od. 4. 816; 11. 495; comp. Thucyd. 1. 3; Strab. 9. 431. The Melitæans, who dwelt in the south of Pharsalus, reported that there had once been a town called Hellas in their neighbourhood, the inhabitants of which had settled amongst them; in proof of this they pointed to Hellen's tomb in the market-place. Strabo, ubi sup. Phthia is extended to the banks of the Peneus by Hesiod. apud. Schol. Pind. Pyth. 9. 6.

the ante-Doric inhabitants of Ægina, whom the mythi of the Æacids represented as related to them¹⁵, and perhaps likewise the bands of Protesilaus and Philoctetes, whose real name was Phthians¹⁶. The root of those appellations is probably to be traced to a primeval relation in which the Hellenic race stood to Hella, the sanctuary at Dodona, and the Helli or Selli there¹⁷. But the accounts which the genealogical poetry of the Hellenes gives is very different. This was neither calculated to trace such a derivation in the proper manner, nor to leave untried an interpretation of its own peculiar kind. Hesiod¹⁸ was the first, it appears, who, losing sight of the radical signification of these words, inserted a hero, the son of Deucalion, called Hellen, who is unknown to Homer, in the early annals of the Hellenico-Thesalian history; Hellen's sons, Æolus and Dorus, and his grandsons, Achæus and Ion, likewise posterior to the Homeric age¹⁹, became the mythic founders of the Hellenic chief nations, the Æolians, Dorians, Achæans, and Ionians²⁰. Deucalion and his wife Pyrrha are to be regarded as emblems of

¹⁵ Comp. Müller, *Æegin.* 18; *Prolegom.* in *Mythol.* 168.

¹⁶ Heyne, *Il.* 2. 683; and 13. 686. ¹⁷ See *Append.* vi.

¹⁸ See the *Fragm.* in *Tzetz. ad Lycophr.* 284; comp. *Apollod.* 1. 7. 2; and *Strab.* 8. 383, who is, in this respect, still more prejudiced than on Homeric subjects.

¹⁹ Homer's Æolus stands alone, *Odyss.* 10. 2; the names Ionians and Dorians are seldom mentioned (*Ἴῶνες* of the Athenians, *Il.* 13. 685; Dorians in *Crete*, *Od.* 19. 177,) and possess not the lustre of heroic genealogy. *Comp.* §. 13. n. 57.

²⁰ See the detailed accounts in *Prideaux on the Marm.* *Oxon.* 366, sqq. The now almost universally acknowledged fabulousness of these and the other heroic progenitors of the Grecian races, may be easily gathered from such examples as *Andreas*, (original man,) said to be the first inhabitant of the *Orchomenian plain*, son of the river *Peneus*, *Paus.* 9. 34. 5; *Thessalus*, the son of *Jason*, *Diodor.* 4. 55; *Penestus*, his descendant, *Schol. Aristoph. Vesp.* 1263. Compare the corresponding opinions of *Buttmann*, *über die mythischen Verbind.* etc., *Berl. Abh.* 1818. 1819. p. 216, sqq.; and *Müller*, *Prolegom.* 178, sqq. 216.

the Thessalian plain, from which the waters of the inland lake had retired, and into which inhabitants descended from the surrounding mountains²¹. The original merely local tradition of the earliest human settlements in the newly-created Thessalian plain, in conjunction with the increasing extension of the Hellenic name, gradually became diversified, adorned with foreign additions, and connected with other legends; and all this with a decided tendency to exalt the origin of that race, whose name had become extended into a designation for the whole nation. To this must be referred the union between Deucalion and Prometheus²², by which the history of the Hellenes was traced to the commencement of the human race, as well as the legend, which, however, more particularly appertained to the person of Deucalion, of the creation of a new race of men out of stones²³, whereby his people not only acquired a claim to *autochthony*, but also a nobility, like that of the Theban Sparti²⁴, the connection of Deucalion with Parnassus²⁵, as well as with Delphi, which afterwards became the central point of Grecian life; and lastly, the fiction of his son or grandson Amphictyon²⁶, which represented the progress of political society in the aggregation of the individual

²¹ Opus and its harbour Cunos were considered the first abodes of Deucalion after the flood; Pind. Ol. 9. 66, sqq., and Schol.; comp. Boeckh. Explicat. 190. 191. In this place, between Opus and Cunos, there was a *πεδῖον εὐδαίμων*, Strab. 9. 425; hence the Leleges, (see §. 10. n. 7,) were also called Deucalion's people, Dionys. 1. 19; and the fiction of a race sprung from stones was transferred to them. Hesiod. ap. Strab. 7. 322; Pind. O. 9. 70.

²² Apollod. 1. 7. 2; Apollon. Rh. 3. 1086.

²³ See n. 21.

²⁴ See §. 30. n. 23.

²⁵ Pind. Ol. 9. 66, sqq.; Apollod. 1. 7. 2; Apollon. Rh. 3. 187; Par. Marm. Chr. Ep. 2; on which comp. Prideaux, 343, sqq.

²⁶ Apollod. 3. 14. 5; Dionys. Hal. 4. 25; comp. Tittmann, Amphict. p. 12.

popular communities of ancient times into confederate bodies ²⁷.

e. The Hellenes as the collective People of the Historical Age.

§ 13. How did it occur that the name of the Hellenes was distinguished above all the other national appellations, and eventually applied to the whole people, whereas Homer calls the collective people Achæans, Danaans, Argives, and none but the bands of Achilles, the Myrmidons, Hellenes? The answer to this question is to be deduced from this very circumstance, namely, the exalted poetical fame of the son of Peleus. For as poetry exercised so extensive and varied an influence on the Grecian character, this designation of the whole nation seems to have arisen from the practice of the epic and lyric poets, who transmitted the strains of the Iliad, and to have been established upon the basis of Homeric allusions. But that amongst the three names of the nations of Achilles, Myrmidons, Achæans, and Hellenes, the last should have obtained the preference, can scarcely be ascribed to chance, which has generally so great a share in the origination of national appellations. Although doubtful, it is not wholly improbable, that the allusion of the name to the Dodonæan sanctuary, and the dignity associated with it, was still remembered. Moreover, not without influence was the idea attached to the province of Hέλλάς, the boundaries of which were

²⁷ The same applies to the Amphietyon in Attica, Apollod. 3. 14. 5; and in Bœotia, Paus. 9. 34. 1.

soon, and even in the *Odyssey*¹, extended beyond the dominions of Achilles. But particular stress must be laid upon the fact, that the materials of the poem derived from the Hellenes, were the more abundant, as the powerful Ajax, a descendant of Æacus, was closely allied with Achilles, the most illustrious personage of the meridian of national chivalry, both by the ties of consanguinity, and the possession of heroic attributes. The appellation *Panhellenion*, for the supposed temple of Æacus, may be very ancient²; the history of Æacus himself is associated by a sort of mythical connection with that of Deucalion; a new race of men is created for both. The migration of the Bœotians from Thessaly carried Thessalico-Æacid traditions into Bœotia; Hesiod, who dwelt in Bœotia, is said to have been the first to explain the word *Myrmidons* by “first men³,” and it is possible that he, like Pindar⁴, afterwards sang the mythical affinity between Ægina and Thebes, the Æacids and the Cadmeans; he and Archilochus first employed the words *Hellenes* and *Panhellenes* in reference to all the tribes of the collective nation⁵. But a political idea appears to have been combined with poetical gratification, for in the opposition between Æacids and Pelopids, exhibited in the Homeric poems⁶, the bold attitude of Achilles in the camp at Troy, with respect to Agamemnon, might, at a time when the royal power was limited by the nobles, gain Achilles friends as a political character.

¹ *Odyss.* 1. 344; 15. 80.

² Müll. *Æginet.* § 5.

³ *Schol. Pind. Nem.* 3. 21; Tzetz. ad *Lycoph.* 176.

⁴ *Isthm.* 4. 38; comp. *Nem.* 4. 36—39.

⁵ *Strab.* 8. 370; comp. *Hesiod. Op. et D.* 826.

⁶ *Comp. Müll. Ægin.* 36.

Moreover, this, as well as the influence of the poetical feeling, received a definite direction and a more decided character from the responses of the Delphic oracle, wherein the Hellenic name occurred⁷, and from the authority of the Amphictyonic council, which was connected with the Delphic sanctuary. How far this is from being foreign to the history of the Hellenic name, is proved by the tradition which derived it from the offspring of Deucalion, Amphictyon, and the historical enumeration of the confederate nations⁸, among which, those from the territory of Achilles occur as Achæans or Phthiotans, together with whom the Dolopians, at one time the subjects of Phœnix the Hellenic governor⁹, and the Ænians, possessed the most immediate claims to the name of Hellenes. It is true there exists no memorial to show that the Amphictyons ever called themselves Hellenes; but who will infer from this, that they did not at an early period apply the name to themselves? Or even supposing them not to have done so themselves—for it was a rare occurrence that the name of a people obtained currency from within, or by means of a formal decree—that it might not, at a very early period, have been used as their designation in poetry¹⁰? Finally, the union of the Amphictyons might operate retrospectively on the custom of applying a general name to the nations of that country, and in this

⁷ See Plut. Lyc. 6, Διὸς Ἑλλανίου, (instead of the false reading Συλλα-νίου), Ἀθηναῖς Ἑλλανίας (instead of Συλλ.); comp. Müller, Prolegom 181.

⁸ Tittmann, Amphic. 33, sqq.

⁹ Hom. Il. 9, 480; comp. Strab. 9. 431. 434.

¹⁰ Tittmann's conjecture (Amph. 24.) that Homer might have employed the word Panhellenes, Il. 2. 530, in this sense, at any rate applies to the author of the interpolated verse.

instance the poetical impulse directed to the *Æacid* Hellenes. At the same time the diffusion of the name in the Peloponnesus became more general by means of the Dorians. Although these were not in the degree which Herodotus assumes, so strictly speaking, Hellenes, as the Ionians were Pelasgians, they still took with them inhabitants of the Thessalian plain, and the testimony that the Spartans, called the Dodonæan sanctuary *Hella*¹¹, affords grounds for the conjecture, that the name Hellenes was not only current amongst them, but was perhaps, as has been already shown, even invested with peculiar dignity from its reference to that institution. The establishment of the Olympic games at length occasioned more frequent meetings of the general body; and here, where the umpires were originally called *Hellanodicæ*, *Archilochus*, the national poet of that panegyris¹², seems to have given universal currency to the name, which, upon the authority of Hesiod, he employed as a general denomination.

If we once more recur to the commencement of the Hellenic period, as to a great political change, this appears to have reposed upon a groundwork laid in the Pelasgic times, whilst the Hellenes seem to have been closely connected with the ancient Pelasgic sanctuary of Dodona, and not opposed to the Pelasgians as an essentially distinct main tribe. That change must not be regarded as having been produced by the preponderance of any foreign principle over the Pelasgic; but as an event which may be traced to the internal institutions of the Pelasgians themselves. In this manner

¹¹ Hesych. 'Ελλά, 1. 1180.

¹² Pind. Ol. 9. 1, and Schol.

the purer account of the ancients becomes reconciled with the general analogy of national history, which was unable to explain how an aboriginal people in Hellas, distinguished by a peculiar character, could have been deprived of its nationality by a tribe distributed amongst its population. The commencement of the conversion of the ancient Pelasgic into the heroic system cannot be traced chronologically, and occasional vestiges only can be discerned in the accounts of poetry and tradition. For in the same manner as the Pelasgians adhered to the worship of nature, their appellation for the objects of public life were in the single provinces derived from the names of princes, wherein the personified objects of nature, river, mountain, the quality of the soil, etc., may be recognised, such as Inachus, Eurotas, Lycaon, Cranaus, Piasus, etc. With the termination of these commence the heroic genealogy, and the relationship or alliance of the princes, which, by means of the pedigree afterwards framed, were carried up to Hellen.

The consideration of the order of things in the heroic age, which appeared the more brilliant, the more remote from its character the political system of reality became, had a natural influence on the estimation of the ancient Pelasgic times. Homer, as has been already observed, makes honourable mention of the Pelasgians; the people itself he only commemorates as being settled in Asia, the Troad, and Crete; but he records a Pelasgic Zeus on the Hellenic continent. But when the glory attending what was represented as the only legitimate form of government, that of

the heroic ages, continued to derive new force from the strains of the Homeric epic, those nations which had once lived under such a government became invested with a sort of dignity, as the subjects of an ancient monarchy; whilst such as possessed no share in epic fame, therefore the Pelasgians in particular, who had never been governed by heroic princes, were considered as essentially foreign to its spirit, and opposed to it¹³.

This impression was determined by the circumstance already stated, namely, that the character of the separate Pelasgic tribe, the Tyrrhenian Pelasgi, who were unconnected with the Hellenic state system, was ascribed to the ancient nation. Add to this political consideration the difference in the religious character of the ancient and modern races, which undoubtedly operated to a considerable extent. The simple adoration of nature that marked the primitive ages, was superseded by the youthful and sensual worship of a race of gods framed in the likeness of humanity, so that the sublimity and purity of the earlier faith could no longer be recognised. This accounts for the prejudiced view of the subject which Herodotus takes.

But so much is certain, that the Pelasgian period resembles the dawn which precedes the full light of day. We are unable to give exact particulars of the relations that subsisted between the tribes individually and collectively, or of their public institutions. That seed which had begun to shoot in the Pelasgian, sprang up, blossomed, and ripened in the course of the Hellenic age.

¹³ This corresponds with Priam's having a daughter of the Lelegian king Altes for his concubine. Hom. Il. 21. 85. 88.

Thus admitting that these despised remnants of the once brave Pelasgic race originally possessed its virtues, we see, that upon the development of a new and more powerful principle, an anterior one, though by no means ignoble in itself, not only fails to advance, but even degenerates from its characteristic worth; and if the Greeks, at a subsequent period, in a diversity of circumstances still universally retained one uniform national impress, this proves that their nationality attained its full strength and maturity upon the development of the Hellenic element.

Before we accompany the hordes, which, in pursuance of the three great migrations, viz., of the Thessalians, Bœotians, and Dorians, quitted their home upon the continent into their new settlements without the mother country, let us once more direct our attention to the races, which in the historical age constituted the Greek nation, and were partakers of the common name; in which survey, however, we can propose nothing more than to establish a basis, whereon the ensuing account of their political progress may repose. The task of ascertaining in detail the original character and habitations of the single races, must be left to those who are eminently versed in researches of such a nature.

The migration of the Thessalians into the plain of the Peneus, appears to have been the event that marked the commencement of the historical time, and indirectly to have given the first impulse to the radical change that pervaded the whole political system of Greece; they were a Threspo-

tian people ¹⁴, half-brethren of the genuine sons of Greece, and were afterwards looked upon as forming part of the general nation. In the mountains around them to the south, along the Spercheus, dwelt the Æteans or Ænians (*Enienes*) ¹⁵; the Malieis or Melieis from Thermopylæ along the Maliac gulf ¹⁶; the Phthiotan Achæans to the east of them, in the former territories of Achilles ¹⁷, as far as the eastern coast of the Pagasæan gulf; the Magnetes by Pelion and Ossa, along the coast ¹⁸; the Perrhæbians in the northern Thessalian mountains, down into the plain below, with unsettled boundaries ¹⁹, and finally near the sources of the Spercheus, at the confine of the Othrys and Pindus ²⁰; and westward of the Pindus the Dolopes ²¹, who are likewise subsequently found on Scyros ²². These tribes were all in existence at the time of Xerxes, under whom they performed military service ²³, and the greater part of them could still be assembled, by the call of the Roman Flaminius, to grasp at the semblance of liberty ²⁴. Their relation to the leading people of the plain, the Thessalians, as well as the subject of their slaves, will be treated below. Lastly, on the heights of the Pindus, not far from the source of the Peneus, dwelt the Æthices, mentioned by Homer, and afterwards considered as belonging to

¹⁴ Herod. 7. 176; comp. Hygin. 225; Thessalus, founder of the sanctuary of Dodona.

¹⁵ On the two names being designations for one race only, see Tittmann, *Amph.* 41.

¹⁶ Strab. 9. 429; see their three tribes, Παράλιοι, Ἰερῆς, Τραχίνιοι, Thuc. 3. 92.

¹⁷ Herod. 7. 196—198; comp. Tittmann, *Amph.* 42.

¹⁸ Strab. 9. 429. 442.

¹⁹ Strab. 8. 439—444.

²⁰ Strab. 8. 434. 437.

²¹ Thuc. 2. 102.

²² Thuc. 1. 98. As Pelasgians, they are called pirates by Scym. 583.

²³ Herod. 7. 131. 185.

²⁴ Polyb. 18. 29. 30.

Epirus²⁵. The Opuntian Locrians, named after the mother city Opus²⁶, dwelt about the Eubœan sea; the Epicnemidian, from the mountain Cnemus, were not distinguished from the mother tribe, as a separate community, till afterwards²⁷. The Dorians resided to the west of them, in the valley of the Upper Cephissus, and to the north-west about Parnassus; and the Phocians in the northern, eastern, and southern parts of Parnassus, as far as the Crissæan sea. The former still maintained themselves, after the migration of their bravest kinsmen, as a free mountain race, and never became wholly estranged from them; the Delphians were distinct from the Phocians, both by extraction and character²⁸. The district of Phocis separated the eastern from the Ozolian Locrians²⁹, who, together with their neighbours the Ætolians and the Acarnanians, mixed with the northern Epirote half-Greeks³⁰, as the northern Thessalian races did with the Macedonians.

The Bœotians pressed by the Thessalians, quitted their abodes in Thessaly and Arne, and occupied Bœotia, which was thereupon named after them, where, according to tradition, or rather because Homer names some Bœotians in the Grecian camp at Troy, a portion of them were supposed to have resided at an earlier period³¹. They expelled as many of the Theban Cadmeans as did not prefer a state of servitude in their own

²⁵ Hom. Il. 2. 744; Strab. 8. 326; 9. 430.

²⁶ Str. 9. 416. 425.

²⁷ Strab. ub. sup. 424. 425. Compare the accounts in Schol. Pind. Ol. 11. 13; and in Steph. Byz. 'Οζόλαι, which must be emended from Strabo.

²⁸ See § 36. n. 6.

²⁹ Strab. 9. 425.

³⁰ Concerning the tribes of the Locrians, see Thucyd. 3. 101; of the Ætolians, 3. 94; comp. § 5. n. 11.

³¹ Thuc. 1. 12; Müller, Orchom. 391, sqq.

country; the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians, who at that time forced their way into Attica, and thence proceeded to Lemnos and Samothrace³², appear to have belonged to their tribe. Other bodies joined the Æolic and Ionic migration, and their descendants maintained themselves in Tenedos and Priene³³; the Ægidæ in Laconia, and the Gephyræi in Athens, were single Cadmean tribes³⁴. The Orchomenian Minyans and the Cadmeans in the Bœotian migration experienced a similar fate; a portion of them took part in the Ionic migration, and founded Teos³⁵. But the Minyans, who had been resident in Lemnos from the earliest ages³⁶, were expelled by the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians, wandered to Laconia, and thence obtained permanent footing in Thera, Cyrene, Melos, Gortys, Crete, and Triphylia³⁷; after that time the Caucones disappeared from the last-mentioned place; but the Minyans are afterwards respectively named Lepreatians, Macistians, etc., from the cities they founded³⁸; the Paroreatians are mentioned as then belonging to them³⁹, though they had originally formed part of another race⁴⁰.

The Ionians, who, together with the Achæans, by means of a fictitious genealogy, recording two

³² Herod. 6. 157, sqq.; comp. Müller, Orch. Append. i. ii.

³³ Müller, Orch. 398. 399.

³⁴ Herod. 5. 57. 62; Müller, ubi sup. 118.

³⁵ Paus. 7. 3. 3; Müller, 399.

³⁶ Müller, cap. 14.

³⁷ Herod. 4. 145, sqq.; Müller, cap. 16—18.

³⁸ Comp. § 32. n. 22.

³⁹ Herod. 4. 148.

⁴⁰ Ibid. 8. 73. When Buttmann (über die Minyæ, comp. § 11. n. 2.) differs from Müller, and advances an opinion to the effect that Minyæ was an epithet adopted previously to the above mentioned migrations by several races established in Triphylia, Thera, etc., from motives of national pride—connects the word with Menu, Manes, Minos, the Lydian Manes and Mæones, the German Mannus, etc., and regards these collectively as symbolical of man—first man, he does not invalidate the migrations in question, although he may only allow them to have been the subsequent expeditions of cognate races.

mythical grandsons of Hellen, Ion and Achæus, the sons of the fugitive Xuthus⁴¹, were numbered amongst the Greeks, appear to have had their primitive seats on the eastern shores of the Ionian sea⁴²; they occupied the north coast of the Peloponnesus, called Ægialea⁴³, and spread over the land of Cynuria⁴⁴, the Argolic Acté⁴⁵, Attica and Eubœa⁴⁶, where the Abantes⁴⁷ are no longer found in the historical times; in Attica the Ionic character appears to have prevailed from the time of Theseus⁴⁸. Those from Ægialea subsequently made way for the Laconian Achæans, proceeded to Attica, and there mixed with hordes composed of other races, embarked on the sea, and steered towards the east⁴⁹; such as were scattered over other parts of the Peloponnesus mingled with the Dorians.

The Dorians who were in Hellas, first of all neighbours of the Lapithæ in Hestiæotis, and afterwards dwelt near the Cæta in Dryopis, which was from them named Doris⁵⁰; migrated under the conduct of Heraclid leaders to the Peloponnesus, and became the prevailing tribe in Laconia, Messenia, Argos, Corinth, Sicyon, Phlius, Epidaurus, Trœzen, Hermione, and the Halieis; as well as

⁴¹ Strab. 8. 383; Apollod. 1. 7. 2; Paus. 7. 1. 2.

⁴² Were the Phæaciæans related to them? Amongst the former there were twelve rural divisions, Hom. Od. 8. 390. It is also worthy of remark, that the Ionians are only once mentioned in Homer (see § 12. n. 19). On the other hand see Buttmann (über d. mythische Verbind., in Berl. Abh. 1818. 1819. p. 222, sqq.), who considers the Ionian race to have been spread over the whole of the Peloponnesus, along the coasts, and northward in the interior of Greece, the Danaans, Argives, and Achæans as comprised under it; and recognises the Ionian name in Iasos, Io, Iasion, Jason, Iolchos, an opinion in which I cannot concur, at the same time that I admit its plausibility.

⁴³ Strab. 8. 383. 386.

⁴⁴ Herod. 8. 73.

⁴⁵ On Epidaurus, see Paus. 7. 4. 3; and Müll. Dor. 1. 81. On Trœzen, Ibid. 82; comp. § 43. n. 19.

⁴⁶ Thuc. 7. 57.

⁴⁷ Hom. Il. 2. 536. Are these the Thracian Abantes?

⁴⁸ See below § 43.

⁴⁹ See § 14.

⁵⁰ Müller, Dor. 1. 27. 41.

in Megaris without the Peloponnesus⁵¹. The previous occupants of these districts either submitted to, or became blended with them; with the exception of the Laconian Achæans, a numerous body of whom proceeded towards Ægialea, drove out the Ionians, and occupied the lands along the coast, which were from that time denominated Achaia⁵². The Dorians were accompanied by some Ætolians under Oxylus, who subjugated the Epeans in Elis, and became the dominant tribe there under the name of Eleans; in process of time the inhabitants of Pisatis and Triphylia likewise became subject to them, without any mixture of the tribes; the former are, however, afterwards called Periœci⁵³.

Finally, the Arcadians maintained themselves as the pure and unalloyed sons of their native country, with which they continued in uninterrupted harmony. The Cynætheis, at the eastern foot of the Cyllene, were distinguished from the inhabitants of the other districts by their rude and uncivilised character⁵⁴.

III. GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE HABITATIONS OF THE GREEKS WITHOUT THE MOTHER COUNTRY.

§ 14. If omitting the consideration of the manifold causes which conduced to loosen the ties of the heroic political system, we confine our attention to the operation of a restless and unceasing pressure from without, we shall perceive that the

⁵¹ See below, § 31. 32.

⁵² Strab. 8. 385. 386; Paus. 7. 1. 3.

⁵³ Strab. 8. 357; Paus. 5. 4. 2; comp. below, § 32, n. 21. 22.

⁵⁴ Polyb. 4. 20.

principal impulse to the migrations of the Greeks from their original seats, was given by the settlement of the Thessalians in the plain of the Peneus¹; the Bœotians were the first they supplanted; but the migration of the Dorians was nearly contemporaneous. The natives were almost universally driven from their original habitations; numerous multitudes soon yielded to the inroads of conquerors, and the encroachments of want, and sought new homes beneath other skies, and on foreign ground: by which means such a multitude of Grecian settlements ensued, that the migration of nations itself, notwithstanding its numbers were incalculably greater, does not present a richer or a more diversified picture. The remark of Cicero, that a Grecian border as it were was attached to the territory of the Barbarians², may be regarded as applying to all those countries which extended from the coasts of Spain to the innermost creek of the Pontus.

Through the Ionic migration, the rocky island of Delos³, and the surrounding Cyclades became Grecian; till that event they had for the most part been inhabited by Carians and Phœnicians⁴, but were now in a great measure occupied by the associates of the Ionic migration. The largest amongst them called Naxos, teemed with abundance⁵, An-

¹ I decline entering into an examination of the traditional accounts of colonies before the Doric migration, which the primitive and unshaken faith of Raoul-Rochette has dilated into the contents of nearly two whole volumes: the Greeks were not satisfied with the almost miraculous diffusion of their race; their fictions exaggerated both time and space.

² De Repub. p. 132.

³ *Κρῶναίη*, Pind. Isthm. 1. 3; Orpheus Arg. 1354. According to Liv. 36. 43. also Ventosissima.

⁴ Herod. 1. 171; Thucyd. 1. 5. 8.

⁵ Plin. His. Nat. 4. 12. with Strab. 10. 489; Athen. 2. 52. B; Agathemer, 1. 5. Comp. Choiseul-Gouffier, 1. 41. 42; Clarke, 2. 2. 390.

dros⁶, Tenos⁷, Ceos⁸, Syros⁹ and Cythnus¹⁰ offered arable and pasture land of the most productive description, to which Siphnus added rich veins of silver¹¹, Paros, marble quarries¹²; and honey as sweet as that of Attica came from all the Cyclades¹³; at the same time there were splendid harbours at Paros¹⁴, Ios¹⁵, and Myconos¹⁶, between which and Tenos, the seamen finds a secure channel¹⁷, whilst the sky smiles with the same cloudless serenity on Siphnus¹⁸, as on Attica.

In the north the island of Thasos which abounded in gold¹⁹, and the productions of the vegetable kingdom was furnished with inhabitants from Paros, and Thasos, Andros, Chalcis, Eretria, Corinth, and some of the Greek cities of Asia, erected on the southern coast of Thrace, and particularly upon the three inviting forelands, nearly forty cities²⁰, amongst which Potidæa was situated on one of the most fertile and commodious points²¹.

The course of the Minyan, old Achæan, and Dorian emigrants from the east coast of the Peloponnesus, was directed to the southern islands of the Archipelago. Amongst the Cyclades, Melos, which possessed a harbour²², and like the others was

⁶ Tournefort, voy. 1. 348. ⁷ Plint. Hist. Nat. 4. 12; Kinsbergen, 116.

⁸ Diodor. 4. 81, sqq.; Virgil. Georg. 1. 14; Clarke, 2. 2. 446.

⁹ Εὐβοτος, εὐμηλος, οἶνοπληθής, πολύπυρος, Hom. Od. 15. 405.

¹⁰ Κύθνιος τυρός, Steph. Byz. Κύθνος.

¹¹ Herod. 3. 5. 7; Strab. 10. 494; Paus. 10. 11. 2; Suidas Σίφνιοι.

¹² Strab. 10. 487; Plin. Hist. Nat. 36. 5. ¹³ Strab. 10. 489.

¹⁴ Scylax, 49. has two. The harbour of Naussa is renowned at present, Kinsb. 123.

¹⁵ Kinsb. 134.

¹⁶ Ibid. 118.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Tournefort, 1. 172; Choiseul-Gouffier, 1. 15.

¹⁹ Herod. 6. 46. Hence Χρυσή, Eustath. ad Dionys. Perieg. 517. On its harbours see § 1. n. 6.

²⁰ Raoul-Rochette hist. de l'établisse. etc. 3. 198—213.

²¹ Liv. 44. 10. 11.

²² A prey to volcanic fires, it is now the seat of mephitic vapours, Choiseul-Gouff. 1. 8. 11, sqq. Comp. Müller, Orch. 324.

once blessed with abundance²³, was the only one occupied by Dorian settlers. Thera, from its beauty called Calliste²⁴, lay towards Africa, and furnished Cyrene, famed for its three crops²⁵, its hides, horses²⁶, and silphium²⁷, with Greek inhabitants, for the most part like those of the mother state, of the race of the Minyans²⁸; its colony Barce, likewise had the advantage of a harbour²⁹. On Crete Dorians from Laconia and Argolis likewise found habitations; Lyctus was rebuilt, and other cities supplied with a new population³⁰; but Crete, although connected by a double tie with the inhabitants of the continent, was looked upon as lying without the range of the political intercourse of Greece, properly so called, to which it was hardly less alien, than the Epirote tribes. On the other hand, the maturity of the Grecian character was exhibited in Rhodes, where the lofty Atabyris³¹ rises, the sun shines with unclouded splendour³², the purest and most genial air is inhaled³³, and the rarest fruits abound³⁴; its harbours are of unusual excellence³⁵, and the strait³⁶ which divides it from the Carian coast³⁷ about twenty-three miles in breadth, was of the greatest importance to traffic³⁸. Crapathus situated between Rhodes and Crete, and the islands off the west coast of Caria, Syme, Nisyros, and Cos, were peopled by

²³ Kinsb. 41.²⁴ Herod. 4. 147.²⁵ Herod. 4. 199.²⁶ Hermipp. ap Ath. 1. 27. E.²⁷ τὸ Βάρτου σίλφιον, Aristoph. Plut. 926. Comp. Equit. 891; Av. 534. 1578, 1581. See at large Thrice, Hist. Cyren. 227, sqq.²⁸ See Müller, Orchom. cap. 16. 17.²⁹ Raoul-Rochette, 3. 62, sqq.³⁰ Pind. Ol. 7. 25; Plin. Hist. Nat. 2. 62.³¹ Meursius, Rhod. 1; cap. 3. 2; cap. 1, sqq.³² Diodor. 20. 85, sqq.³³ Called Peræa, Liv. 32. 33; 33. 18.³⁴ Demosth. adv. Dionysiod. 1285. R,²⁹ Scylax, 109.³¹ Strab. 14. 655.³³ Sueton. Tiber. 11.³⁶ Liv. 45. 10.

Greek colonists³⁹, the last of these alone, however, attained much importance. On the west coast of Caria were erected Halicarnassus, where its harbours and citadel secured it the dominion of the sea⁴⁰, and Cnidus which occupied a bold and secure position on Cape Triopium, and had two ports⁴¹. The Milesian Cape Posidium was the northern limit to the Doric settlements⁴². Beyond the straits of Rhodes the seas were considered Grecian as far as the Chelidonian isles, or the city of Phaselis, on the east coast of Lycia⁴³: although the Grecian colonies, which were for the most part Rhodian, were few in number, and none of them attained consideration. But in Cyprus, in that sea the extreme nurse of the Grecian race, which was said to have been conducted thither by Teucer⁴⁴, the nobler blossoms of human culture were never unfolded; the oriental character predominated: the Phœnicians had a preponderating influence, Amasis of Egypt sent some Ethiopians to its shores⁴⁵, and the exuberance of nature⁴⁶ served to stifle every higher feeling in sensual enjoyment. The settlements of the Ionians occupied the whole of the middle portion of the west coast of Asia Minor, from Cape Posidium as far as Phocæa⁴⁷ and the adjacent islands, on which had formerly dwelt Carians, Leleges, and Cretans⁴⁸. No region was ever occupied by the Greeks which possessed the

³⁹ Raoul-Roch. 3. 70, sqq. Concerning the supposed earlier Grecian settlements on those islands and on Rhodes, according to Hom. *Il.* 2. 653, sqq. see Müller, *Dor.* 1. 105, sqq. Comp. his *Prolegom.* 403.

⁴⁰ Scyl. 91; Vitruv. 2. 8; Choiseul-Gouff. 1. 96; Clarke, 2. 1. 204. n.

⁴¹ Clarke, 2. 1. 214—216.

⁴² Strab. 14. 632. 651.

⁴³ Thus in the pretended treaty of Cimon, Plut. *Cim.* 13; Isocrat. *Paneg.* 33; Lycurg. *c. L.* 181. R; Diod. 12. 4, etc.

⁴⁴ Pind. *Nem.* 4. 75, sqq.; Sophocl. *Aj.* 1036.

⁴⁵ Herod. 7. 90.

⁴⁶ Meurs. *Cypr.* cap. 4.

⁴⁷ Strab. 13. 632.

⁴⁸ Herod. 1. 146; Strab. *ubi sup.* and 14. 640; Diod. 5. 84; Paus. 7. 3. 1.

advantage of climate in a more eminent degree than this⁴⁹, and no less favourable were its seas and coasts. Within the boundaries of Caria was situated Miletus, with its five ports, the best of which was formed and guarded by the island of Lade⁵⁰; besides these there was the harbour of Panormus near the temple of the Didymæan Apollo⁵¹, and another by the island of Patmos opposite⁵². The sands deposited by the Mæander⁵³ have thrown forward the coast round Miletus. Lade is united to the mainland; the site of Myus, once a maritime city, is at some distance from the shore⁵⁴; and neither of the two harbours of Priene any longer exists⁵⁵. Opposite the headland of Mycale⁵⁶, once covered with forests, and abundantly furnished with game, lies Samos, from which it is divided by a narrow strait⁵⁷; its western coast, like that of the neighbouring Icarus, is protected by formidable rocks, and a dangerous surf⁵⁸; it possesses an excellent natural harbour to the north-west, and its roadstead to the south-west was once securely guarded by a dam of stone⁵⁹. It was so called from its mountain⁶⁰, the highest point in the Ægean sea, which is seldom overcast with clouds, and may be seen from Hymettus⁶¹. Natural productions of

⁴⁹ Herod. 1. 142: "Ἴωνες — τοῦ μὲν οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν ὠρέων ἐντῷ καλλίστῳ ἐτύγχανον ἰδρυσάμενοι πόλιας πάντων ἀνθρώπων, ὧν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. Comp. Paus. 7. 5. 2.

⁵⁰ Strab. 14. 635; Thucyd. 8. 17; Choiseul-Gouff. planche to 1. 173.

⁵¹ Herod. 1. 157; Paus. 5. 7. 3. ⁵² Clarke, 2. 2. 370. Now *la Scala*.

⁵³ Strab. 12. 580; Choiseul-Gouff. planche to 1. 112; v. Hoff. gesch. d. Erdoberfl. 1. 257, sqq.

⁵⁴ Chandler, As. Min. 167.

⁵⁵ Scyl. 90; Strab. 12. 579.

⁵⁶ Εὐθηρον, εὐδενδρον; Strab. 14. 636.

⁵⁷ Clarke, 2. 2. 364. asserts that a person calling from the other side may be distinctly understood.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 2. 1. 192.

⁵⁹ Scyl. 90. Comp. Liv. 37. 10. 11; Pococke, 3. 38; Kinsb. 112.

⁶⁰ Strab. 10. 457. Σάμος means height.

⁶¹ Clarke, 2. 2. 365.

the choicest kind, amongst the chief of which were wine and oil, yielded abundant, and in parts double crops⁶². In the beautifully winding gulf between Samos and Chios, which receives the waters of the Cayster, lay Ephesus on that river itself, deprived, it is true, of its once convenient harbour⁶³, by the accumulation of the sands⁶⁴, but very favourably situated for an intercourse with the interior of western Asia, and on that account afterwards one of the chief commercial stations in the world: besides Colophon with the harbour of Notium⁶⁵, Lebedos, and Teos, situated on a strip of land, which, near Cnidus, formed two harbours⁶⁶.

To the north there projects a considerable peninsula, on which the mountain called Mimas is situate. Between this peninsula and Chios there is a navigable channel, once named Embata⁶⁷, for that reason Corycus, in the district of Teos⁶⁸, on the south coast, was a notorious haunt of the pirates⁶⁹. In the channel itself, are the ports of Erythræ⁷⁰ and Phœnicus⁷¹; and on the northern coast of the peninsula Clazomenæ, to which belonged the ancient city of Chyton or Chytron⁷²,

⁶² Athen. 14. 653. F. Comp. Panofka res Sam. p. 6.

⁶³ Scyl. 90.

⁶⁴ Choiseul-Gouff. pl. to 2. 120. Comp. Mannert, 6. 3. 106.

⁶⁵ ἡ ἀνω πόλις was distinguished from the harbour town, Thuc. 3. 34; Diod. 13. 71. Comp. Liv. 37. 26. ⁶⁶ Strab. 14. 642; Liv. 37. 27. 28.

⁶⁷ Τὰ ἔμβαρα. Schol. Thuc. 3. 29; Polyæn. 3. 9. 29. The place Ἐμβαρον Thuc. 3. 29. Clarke describes the prospect as exceedingly beautiful, 2. 1. 188.

⁶⁸ Liv. 37. 12.

⁶⁹ Strab. 14. 644; Liv. 36. 43; Phot. Κωρυκαῖος; Suid. τοῦ δ' ἄρα, Zenob. 4. 75; Vatican App. 4. 7, etc.

⁷⁰ Scyl. 89; Strab. ubi sup.

⁷¹ Thuc. 8. 34; Liv. 36. 45; 37. 16; Poppo. Thucyd. 2. 452. Is it now Tschesmé?

⁷² To this the inhabitants fled from their city, upon being expelled by the Persians. Concerning their attempt to return to the mainland, see Thuc. 8.

erected on the adjacent island. Chios, till very recently the garden of modern Greece, communicated with the sea by means of an admirable harbour⁷³, and is abundantly furnished by nature with all the luxuries of life, and especially with exquisite wine⁷⁴.

The gulf between Chios, Lesbos, and Asia Minor, into which the Pactolus and the Hermus discharge their waters, formerly named the Hermaic gulf, resembles an extensive roadstead; whilst in its innermost bay is the beautiful harbour of Smyrna⁷⁵, the excellence of which was not fully appreciated till modern days. Of the once celebrated harbours of Phocæa⁷⁶, one still continues in use⁷⁷.

Æolis, with Lesbos, colonised by Peloponnesian Achæans⁷⁸, mixed with Æolian hordes from Bœotia and Thessaly, which settled amongst Pelasgians, and other tribes of the same origin⁷⁹, was still more fertile than Ionia, although its climate was less beautiful. The gulf to the south of Lesbos received its appellation from the town of Cyme situated on it, which was so slow in availing itself of its excellent port⁸⁰, that it became a byword to the more active and enterprising of the Greeks⁸¹. The Æolian cities in general, on the coast of Asia

14. 23. This was not accomplished till the time of Alexander; comp. Poppo. ubi sup. 440; and on the harbour, Scyl. 89.

⁷³ Scyl. 89; Strab. 14. 645; Liv. 36. 43; Clarke, 2. 1. 188; Kinsbergen, 110, has only a good roadstead.

⁷⁴ Strab. 14. 645. ⁷⁵ Kinsb. 109, sqq.

⁷⁶ Scyl. 89; Liv. 37. 31. 22.

⁷⁷ Le Bruyn. voy. trad. Franç. p. 166.

⁷⁸ Herod. 1. 149.

⁷⁹ Strab. 13. 622; comp. Raoul-Roch. 3. 34, sqq.

⁸⁰ It was the winter station of the remnants of the Persian fleet after the battle of Salamis. Herod. 8. 130.

⁸¹ Strab. 13. 622. The harbour of Elæa was not appreciated till still later, Liv. 37. 18.

Minor, were eclipsed by the power and splendour of Lesbos. This was marked out by the productive quality of its soil, the most luxuriant vineyards⁸², and its genial air, for the peculiar seat of pleasure⁸³; and adapted by its harbours⁸⁴ of Mitylene and Methymna to command the much frequented channel, by which it is divided from the mainland, as well as the entrance to the gulf of Smyrna. Amongst the northern settlements of the Æolians without the Hellespont, Tenedos, the key to that strait, is rendered of the first importance by the possession of a safe harbour⁸⁵, where those ships anchor, which are prevented by the violent northerly winds from entering the Hellespont⁸⁶.

Polybius was unwilling to write any thing on the subject of the Hellespont, because he considered that there could be no one unacquainted with its peculiar character⁸⁷, and we may dismiss the subject in a very few words. The Chersonese, in ancient as well as in modern days, a bridge⁸⁸ for the migration of nations, and originally inhabited by Thracian tribes, the Dolonci and Apsinthii⁸⁹,

⁸² Strab. 13. 617, sqq.; Athen. 1. 28, sqq.; Plin. Hist. Nat. 14. 7.

⁸³ Hence once called the "blessed," the "love-inspiring." *Macaria*, *Himerte*, Plin. H. N. 5. 39.

⁸⁴ Scyl. 85, sqq. Mitylene was first built upon a small island, afterwards upon Lesbos itself. The Euripus between the two formed two havens; that to the south would contain fifty triremes, and the other was spacious and deep. See Strab. 16. 617; Diod. 13. 79; Xenoph. Hell. 1. 6. 22. The small island is now united to Lesbos. Pococke, 3. 23. Kinsbergen (90), who considers the harbours of Mitylene small, probably alludes to the eastern coast; but the entrance to the principal harbour was apparently to the south, consequently this must have been identical with the present *Porto d'Olive*, or *Port Hiero*. Kinsb. 90; Choiseul-Gouff. 2. 83. The harbour at Pyrrha, Scyl. 87. Choiseul-Gouff. ubi. sup., is now nothing but a shallow creek, which Kinsbergen passes over as a mere cipher in a nautical point of view; but port Sigro, farther westward, is important. Kinsb. ubi sup.

⁸⁵ Etym. M. Σίγρον λιμὴν Τενέδου; Kinsb. 84.

⁸⁶ Comp. Append. i. ⁸⁷ Polyb. 16. 29.

⁸⁸ The place near Sestos, where Xerxes' bridge of boats had been fastened, was significantly denominated Ἀποβάθρα. Strab. 13. 591.

⁸⁹ Herod. 6. 34—36.

near Sestos, advances to within seven stadia of the coast of Asia⁹⁰. The passage across the rapid⁹¹ Hellespont, from Sestos to Abydos, could be effected without difficulty, as the stream flows from Sestos situated somewhat higher, towards the beautiful harbour of Abydos⁹²; but the passage from Abydos to Sestos was very troublesome⁹³. Farther northward, where the current was less rapid, there was another convenient passage from Callipolis to Lampsacus⁹⁴, which was the more traversed, as both from Lampsacus and Ephesus a great road led into the interior of Asia⁹⁵. The brightest gem of the Propontis was Cyzicus, situate upon an island, which was united to the mainland by bridges⁹⁶, and was for that reason called the Chersonese⁹⁷; it had two harbours, which might both be closed when necessary⁹⁸. Astacus, Perinthus, and Selymbria were provided with ports⁹⁹. The unusually favourable situation of Byzantium¹⁰⁰, as well as the inferior though still commodious one of Chalcedon, is attested by the passage of Polybius alluded to above; and the choice of these places for their settlements reflects great credit upon the discernment of the Megarians. Miletus was the first amongst the states to recognise a field for her traffic beyond the Bosphorus, and with unparalleled activity planted her colonies around the Pontus, on appropriate forelands, peninsulas, and in secured and sheltered creeks and

⁹⁰ Herod. 7. 33; Strab. 2. 148; eight stadia, Xenoph. Hel. 4. 8. 5.

⁹¹ Ἀγρόπορος, Hom. Il. 2. 845. ⁹² Polyb. 16. 29.

⁹³ Strab. 13. 591. ⁹⁴ Strab. 13. 589.

⁹⁵ Mannert, 6. 3. 517. ⁹⁶ Strab. 12. 575.

⁹⁷ Ἡ Χερσόνησος τῆς Ἀσίας, Conon. 14.

⁹⁸ Strab. ubi sup. comp. Etymol. Mag. Χυρῶ.

⁹⁹ Scylax, 68. 69. ¹⁰⁰ See my article in Ersch. u. Grub. Encyc.

channels ¹⁰¹, amidst Bithynians, Mariandynians, Paphlagonians, Bastarnæ, Scythians, Sarmatians, in Colchis, and even in the land of the Heniochî, and the wild Achæans ¹⁰². Hence that sea, which had previously been stigmatised as the inhospitable ¹⁰³, became so well known to the Greeks ¹⁰⁴, that it was thenceforward termed the hospitable by pre-eminence; no fish of prey infested its waters, which bore to Greece numerous fleets laden with every description of produce ¹⁰⁵. Heraclea, founded by Megarians, Tanagræans, and Milesians ¹⁰⁶, and the Milesian Sinope, both rose to power and opulence from their admirable position, effectually protected against, or overawing, the contiguous barbarians, and unendangered by Grecian supremacy. The latter possessed those peculiar local advantages which were universally remarked as so congenial to the Grecian taste. It was situated upon a tongue of land, firmly fortified on the land side ¹⁰⁷, holding out the greatest conveniences for navigation, and affording secure shelter in its excellent haven; in addition to this, it exercised the easy and lucrative fishery of the pelamys, innumerable shoals of which come from the waters of the Mæotian gulf, and are driven towards the shores of Sinope ¹⁰⁸. The port of Amisus ranked next to that of Sinope,

¹⁰¹ See Rambach de Mileto; Raoul-Rochette, 3. 386—400; Mannert, 4. 314, sqq.

¹⁰² Ammian. Marc. 22. 8. 25, ultra omnem ferociam sævierunt. See Vales, *ibid.*

¹⁰³ * Ἀξενος, Strab. 7. 298; Æschyl. Prom. 733; ἐχθρόξενος ναύτησι μητρὶα νείων.

¹⁰⁴ Εὐξείνιος κατ' εὐφημισμὸν. Schol. Soph. Œd. 7. 180; Am. Marc. 22. 8. 33; Ovid. trist. 4. 4. 55.

¹⁰⁵ Amongst these there was especially corn—σιτοπομπεία, Strab. 7. 309; saltfish, πάντα τὰρίχη, Hermipp. ap. Ath. 1. 27. E.

¹⁰⁶ Raoul-Roch. 3. 300, sqq.

¹⁰⁷ Polyb. 4. 56.

¹⁰⁸ Strab. 12, 545.

on the south coast of the Pontus¹⁰⁹. Trapezus, founded by Sinope, and during several centuries dependent¹¹⁰, did not become a place of extensive trade till the time of the Romans, whilst Dioscurias was the great emporium of the Caucasian nations. The ancients related that seventy, and according to some even three hundred, different languages were heard upon its marts¹¹¹. On the Tauric Chersonese, where the corn yielded a thousand-fold¹¹², lay Theodosia, with a harbour for a hundred ships¹¹³; but the passage into the Mæotic gulf, the Cimmerian Bosphorus, was obstructed by Panticapæon and Phanagoria¹¹⁴; even in the innermost creek of the Mæotic gulf, at the mouth of the Tanais, the Bosphoran Milesians founded the city of Tanais, which, like Dioscurias, became an important trading place, from the conflux of the surrounding nations¹¹⁵. If compared with this multitude of considerable Milesian settlements towards the east along the shores extending from the mouth of the Borysthenes to the Thracian Bosphorus, the other Milesian¹⁰⁶ plantations, Olbia, Istropolis, Tomi, Odessus, Apollonia, and Mesambria, founded by the Byzantines and Chalcedonians¹¹⁷, appear to have been, with the exception of Olbia¹¹⁸, of little importance, it is still a subject of astonishment that there was not a single nation dwelling around the Pontus, to which the Greeks had not found access; and in

¹⁰⁹ Amm. Marc. ubi sup.

¹¹⁰ Xenoph. Anab. 4. 8. 22; 5. 5. 10.

¹¹² Strab. 7. 311.

¹¹³ Ibid. 7. 309.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. 7. 310. 311.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. 11. 493.

¹¹⁶ Raoul-Roch. 3. 312—318, and 386—388.

¹¹⁷ Herod. 4. 33.

¹¹⁸ Ibid. 4. 17. 18. 74; Strab. 7. 306.

¹¹¹ Strab. 11. 497. 498.

the midst of which they had not, either by stratagem or force, succeeded in obtaining a footing.

In the west, Corinth endeavoured, by means of colonies, to render the coast of the Ionian sea, where the Greek population terminated, dependent upon herself. Leucas, Anactorium, Argos, Amphilocheium, Ambracia, partly founded, or new-peopled, with the co-operation of Corcyra¹¹⁹, kept the navigation of the Grecian seas open to the trade of Corinth; but Corcyra itself, which commandingly extends along the coasts of Epirus, soon asserted, with fearless independence, the sovereignty of the Ionian sea, which was especially favoured by its three harbours¹²⁰, and checked the depredations of the Illyrian pirates, who did not infest the Grecian seas till internal corruption had impaired the strength of Greece. Still farther northward were built Apollonia, Epidamnus¹²¹, (Dyrrachium), and Epidaurus; the importance of the second increased with the gradual extension of intercourse and trade.

Chance and enterprise soon led Grecian mariners through the Sicilian sea. Italy itself, although connected with Greece by means of one of the most ancient colonies of the Eubœan Chalcidians, Cumæ¹²², was not the immediate object of frequent voyages; Sicily offered greater attraction, from its superior harbours and insular character, together with which, Sardinia was, during centuries, the object of repeated and fruitless expeditions¹²³.

¹¹⁹ Raoul-Roch. 3. 183. 290, sqq.; comp. Müller, Dor. 1. 117, sqq.

¹²⁰ Scyl. 5; comp. Thucyd. 3. 72; Poppo. 2. 132.

¹²¹ On the subject of its harbour, see Appian. de civ. Rom. bel. 2. 39.

¹²² Raoul-Roch. 3. 109, sqq.

¹²³ Herod. 1. 170, and the legends of Iolaus, Diodor. 4. 29, sqq.

Corinthians found the once superior harbours¹²⁴ of Syracuse, and after the foundation of the city, Chalcidians, Rhodians, Megarians, Syracusans, etc., vied with each other in settling along the three coasts of the fertile island¹²⁵, whose original inhabitants, the Sicani and Siculi, now retired farther into the interior of the country. Syracuse was distinguished above all other places by its favourable situation; it is recorded, amongst its peculiar characteristics, that not a day elapsed on which the sun did not shine there¹²⁶. Less favoured by their natural conveniences for navigation, than by the excellence of their soil, arose, on the south coast, the Rhodian¹²⁷ Gela, and still higher, its daughter-town, Agrigentum¹²⁸; but Messana offered great attraction as a maritime place, in consequence of its harbour, and its contiguity to the straits, which bounded it in the direction of Italy, and was successively occupied by Cumæans, Chalcidians, Samians, and Messenians. But in no part of the island was the tillage land poor or unproductive, and on this account, and in some measure from the favourable shape of the sea coast, beside those capitals, Naxos, Leontini, Catana, Himera, founded by Chalcidians and Naxians, securely flourished the Megarian Hybla, or Megara and its colony Selinus; even upon the Lipari isles the Greeks found a settlement, abounding in the most luxuriant natural productions¹²⁹. But nowhere

¹²⁴ Seneca consol. ad Marc. 17; Portum quietissimum omnium—sic tutum, ut ne maximarum quidem tempestatum furori locus sit. Comp. Poppo. Thucyd. 2. 510, sqq.; Güller de situ urb. Syracus., Kephallides Reise, vol. ii. and iii.

¹²⁵ See at large Raoul-Roch. 3. 175. 183; 213. 226; 247. 277; 319. 325; 354. 363; comp. Müller, Dor. 1. 110, sqq.; 115, sqq.

¹²⁶ Cicero c. Verr. 2. 5. 11.

¹²⁷ Raoul-Roch. 3. 247, sqq.

¹²⁸ Diod. 13. 81.

¹²⁹ Diod. 5. 9; Paus. 10. 1. 3.

were human passions more active in marring the benefits of nature, than amongst the Grecian towns of this favoured island.

The Greeks never found the harbour of Brundisium¹³⁰, invitingly situated upon that part of the coast of Italy which lies opposite their own country, and is only forty-six miles from Acroceraunia¹³¹; its fame dates from the Roman times. On the other hand, the bay between the two southern points of Italy and the west coast, beheld a number of Grecian, especially Achæan, settlements flourish¹³² in the midst of Japygians, Messapians, Ænotrians, Ausonians, and Tyrrhenians. Tarentum, founded by Laconians, was the only town situate on the gulf named after it, which possessed a harbour¹³³; it was built upon a small foreland¹³⁴, furnished to abundance with the productions of land and sea¹³⁵, and its climate was soft and voluptuous¹³⁶. The harvests of the adjacent Achæan Metapontum were so abundant, that golden ears of corn were sent in gratitude to Delphi¹³⁷. The country about the Siris, where afterwards lay Heraclea, eulogised by Archilochus¹³⁸, and pointed out by Themistocles as aptly situated for the new home of the Athenians¹³⁹, was not less blessed by nature. The situation of Sybaris, although destitute of the advantage

¹³⁰ Mannert. Ital. 2. 42.

¹³¹ Was it at one time a barbarian capital? Scylax only mentions Ὑδροῦς. This harbour, formerly one of the finest in the Adriatic, is now filled with sand and mud, and can only admit fishing boats and other small craft, Riedesel, 231.

¹³² See in general Heyne, Opusc. vol. ii.; Raoul-Roch. 3. 109. 117; 163. 185; Müller, Dor. 1. 125, sqq.

¹³³ Polyb. 10. 1; Strab. 6. 278; Scymnus, 330; Florus, 1. 18.

¹³⁴ It was cut through in the last century, but the channel is again stopped up. Swinburne's Travels, 1. 288; ¹³⁵ Mannert. Ital. 2. 63. 64.

¹³⁶ Riedesel. 204.

¹³⁷ Strab. 6. 264.

¹³⁸ Athen. 15. 524, D.

¹³⁹ Herod. 8. 61. 62.

of ports, could not be surpassed in point of inland attractions¹⁴⁰. The salubrious air of Crotona, the site of which was asserted to have been pointed out by the oracle to its founder, the Heraclid Myscelus, passed into a proverb¹⁴¹. Both were built by Achæans. Locri, where Doric manners became general, was stony and rugged¹⁴², but it was taught to exercise manly virtue. The Chalcidian-Messenian Rhegium, a real sea-fortress, raised itself, for a time, to be the mistress of the strait on which it was situated. The position of Elea was not favourable¹⁴³, but the foundation of Cuma, and its daughter-town Naples, is an evidence of the good fortune which attends the youth of nations. The most beautiful point of Italy was the first to be descried¹⁴⁴.

The coasts of Gaul and Spain may, as the farthest confines in the west, be compared with the shores of the Pontus; here, too, the Ionians established a system of Grecian polity. Massilia, a colony of the Phocæans, blessed with a sky as serene as that of Ionia, and admirably situated for an intercourse with the Gallic tribes, flourished in security and independence far from the rest of the Greeks, and planted around it, towards the east and west, a series of dependent towns, the last of which, westward, Emporiæ¹⁴⁵, is an emblem of the attachment the Greeks manifested for the barbarian coasts, as well as of the desire of intercourse in the narrowest possible political sphere; a Spanish

¹⁴⁰ Strab. 6. 262; Riedesel, 200; Swinburne, l. 362.

¹⁴¹ Ὑγιέστερον Κρότωνος, Strab. 6. 262. 269; Zenob. 6. 27; Schol. Aristoph. Eq. 1100; Steph. Byzan. Συρακοῦς. Suid Ἀρχίας.

¹⁴² Τραχέια, Schol. Pind. Ol. 10. 17. Λοφώδης, ἐπιθαλασσιδίου.

¹⁴³ Strab. 6. 252.

¹⁴⁴ See Mannert, Ital. l. 738, sqq.

¹⁴⁵ Scyl. 3. Ἐμπόριον.

town bordered closely upon the Grecian settlement ¹⁴⁶, and the Greeks did not penetrate any farther into the interior of the country.

IV. CHARACTER OF THE GRECIAN NATION.

§ 15. The sea, especially when it winds round and indents such a land as Greece ¹, must sooner or later become an object of attraction; a nation so destined for a nautical life as the Greeks, will not leave its peculiar mission long untried; but the most forcible natural exhortations do not always call forth a corresponding energy in man; it requires many and various shocks and coincidences, before nature and mankind enter into effectual alliance. Not the Cumæans alone were once for centuries insensible to the advantages of their harbour ²; even Britain's league with the ocean was not effected till the august Elizabeth laid the foundation of her maritime greatness. Admitting that time and chance are necessary for human enterprise and art to assert their power on the sea, this element, nevertheless, soon vindicates its rights as a channel of traffic ³. Nowhere do rivers and seas impede the intercourse of nations; the inhabitant of the coast is borne upon the waves to the opposite dwellers; narrow-minded prejudice departs with him, and he returns with awakened energies

¹⁴⁶ Strab. 3. 160; Liv. 34. 9.

¹ According to the Geogr. Ephemerid. 1799, v. iii. p. 304, Greece has 2880 geographical miles of sea-coast, Italy 2320, and France 1100.

² Strab. 13. 622; comp. § 13, n. 73.

³ Hom. Od. 17. 286.

——— γαστέρα ———
τῆς ἐνεκεν καὶ νῆες ἐϋζυγοὶ ὀπλίζονται
πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρούγετον

Comp. Eurip. Supplic. 210.

πόντον τε ναυστολήμαθ' ὥς διαλλαγὰς
ἔχοιμεν ἀλλήλοισιν ὧν πένοιτο γῆ.

and unwonted powers, whilst boldness and courage become the prominent features of his character⁴. Thus it was that the Greeks became a maritime people, amidst Phœnicians and Illyrians.

On the other hand, mountains often stretch far around as insurmountable barriers, impeding the intercourse and the union of neighbours. Beyond the mountains is incalculably a more marked division than beyond the sea. Whilst Athens, in less than half a century, found means to unite islands and coasts into a confederacy dependent upon herself, which, after the lapse of a few years devolved to Sparta for an equally short period, the Grecian mountain-chains kept up, during centuries, the freedom as well as the disunion of the inhabitants of the precipices on either side of them⁵. When, moreover, a country is so studded with heights and peaks, and so intersected with defiles and gullies as Greece is, it is as natural that self-defence should lead to the construction of walls and citadels, as that rapacious marauders should, from their haunts in the trackless forest, and the beaten mountain-pass, invade the fields and flocks of their neighbours. Now, as the influence of the sea upon such as dwell upon its shores is not always uniform, so mountains do not always operate alike upon the disposition and manners of their inhabitants. One mountain tribe is simple, honest, and faithful; another treacherous, violent, and insensible to justice, duty, and humanity; but they possess, in common, a certain hardness of character, a firm attachment to

⁴ See the just estimate which Cicero formed of the Greek character, *De Repub.* 2. 4. p. 128, sqq. (Stuttg.)

⁵ See the admirable disquisition of Fr. v. Schlegel, *Schriften*, 3. 69.

long-established customs, a repugnance to change, obstinate prejudices, slowness in social advancement, and faith and superstition. The last quality is strikingly exemplified in their abundant stock of local traditions and marvellous tales, which are comparatively rare amongst the inhabitants of lowlands and maritime districts. This may be applied in its full force to the Grecian mountaineers, and especially the Arcadians, to whom nature gave so much occasion for astonishment at her caprices and enigmas.

The Greek nation first received a determinate and lasting impress from the Doric migration, and those immediately connected with it, and can only be duly estimated when regarded under the peculiar form which it bore subsequently to that event. At the same time, together with the more marked lines of character which it derived from the migrations, the exclusive and peculiar properties of the individual tribes became so prominently developed, that we can discover but very few characteristics of a more general nature. Now, though in Homer one uniform colouring seems to be diffused over the national character, we must raise the poetical veil, and may unhesitatingly assert, that a nationality, which went forth from the heroic age with such maturity that it was enabled to preserve its original impress unimpaired, after being transplanted to foreign ground and amongst barbarians, could not have been destitute of the finer shades of individual character; at the same time, it cannot be denied that what had previously been a mere unconscious life of habit, required to be contrasted with foreign

elements to attain accurate and complete self-knowledge.

The original simplicity of the national life of Greece is attested by the primitive manners of the Athenians, the Arcadians, and Achæans, which did not even cease with the historical age; and in general the tribes of the ancient Greeks, though not devoid of enterprise and alacrity, appear to have pursued, during certain periods of time, one regular course, till shocks from without aroused and agitated them. On the other hand, after these had occurred, there followed violent and even impetuous commotions, as is proved by the long-continued chain of the migrations themselves. We may accordingly assert the most marked peculiarity of the Greeks to have been extreme excitability, which, affected by external causes, awakened a corresponding degree of energy, and this exerted itself in domestic feuds, in collisions with neighbours, or in migrations and maritime expeditions. The first were kept up by the natural divisions of the country into small states, so that they never wanted for matter to nourish them; no torpor or lethargy could ensue, but the inner life gradually unfolded itself. Strength was accompanied by the most fearless self-confidence, and by its most undisguised manifestations; modesty and humility were not Greek virtues; but their sense of honour was not spun out of such fine threads as that of modern chivalry; honour was regarded amongst them as based upon right and prerogative; words could not endanger it. Congenial to their love of action was their susceptibility of pleasure and pain. The Greek was easily affected to tears, examples

of stoicism, as regarded pain, can only be adduced amongst the Spartans, and elsewhere should be accounted a total degeneration of the national character. Solon's beautiful reply, when some one wished to console him, that he wept on that very account, that it could not be helped⁶, is truly Grecian. At the same time they possessed a degree of sensuality, and a capacity of enjoyment, which left no mode of pleasure untried⁷. Here we may commend as a national excellence their cultivation of the arts of poetry and music; but in their intercourse with the female sex, they were deficient in that delicacy of feeling which is associated with respect and modest shame. The Grecian mode of expression, on subjects of this nature, was coarse, and sometimes gross; still more depraved was their addiction to unnatural lust. As in this respect, so throughout the Grecian disposition, the bad was found closely bordering upon the noble and the good; and its most conspicuous taints were cupidity⁸, envy⁹, hatred, and cruelty¹⁰. But upon the whole, the youthful turbulence of the nation never arrived at maturity during its political existence; the good neither resided securely and permanently in its heart, nor did the bad ever become fully developed. From the constant influence of passion, the personal and political character must very frequently have

⁶ Diog. Laert. 1. 63.

⁷ Οἱ Ἕλληνες φιλήδονοι. Dion. Chrys. 1. 323.

⁸ E. g. Hesiod. Op. et. Di.: χρήματα γὰρ ψυχὴ πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι. Comp. 339. According to Polyb. 6. 46. many persons were of opinion that the chief merit of Lycurgus consisted in having banished avarice.

⁹ A Persian in Herod. 7. 326. describes it correctly: τοῦ τε εὐτυχέειν φθονέουσι (οἱ Ἕλληνες) καὶ τὸ καέσσον στυγέουσι.

¹⁰ According to Paus. 1. 7. 1. it was only amongst the Athenians that there was an altar of pity; but the disposition of the Athenians, in aftertimes, was but little in unison with this sign.

coincided in those states where there were popular governments. There can be no doubt that the general character is only exhibited in certain indications, unattended by those peculiar modifications which produced a dissimilarity in single races and states, and which cannot be ascribed to the nation at large, without careful limitation.

Here the eye naturally turns to the two principal races which occupied the same seats in the heroic age as they did afterwards, and whose character, therefore, may be regarded as bearing evidences of a strictly national growth, viz., the Arcadians and Athenians. The Arcadians possessed the solidity of the mountain character in their bold and manly disposition, and their love of music. When the land became too confined, there went forth for the purpose of acquiring new seats, not whole tribes, but single and freely-associated hordes or bodies, which sought in foreign warfare¹¹ the means of existence and a field for the exercise of their strength¹².

This custom was peculiar to the Phigalians¹³. The pernicious and demoralising influences of those habits which soldiers brought home with them from foreign countries¹⁴, did not infect the sources of popular life till long afterwards. But the Cynæthians¹⁵ were naturally rude and insensible to the refinements of civilisation. The ancient Athenians

¹¹ Hence the proverb Ἀρκάδας μμούμενος was applied to a person who laboured and suffered for others. Bekker. Anec. 218. Suid.

¹² Such as came to Xerxes were ὀλίγοι τινες βίου τε δεόμενοι καὶ ἐνεργοὶ βουλόμενοι εἶναι. Herod. 8. 26.

¹³ Athen. 10. 442. B. calls them drunkards and rovers.

¹⁴ This was probably the origin of the vice of drunkenness mentioned above. In the Etym. M. the epithet προσέληνοι, which was applied to the Arcadians, is derived from προσελλεῖν, because they were addicted to slander!

¹⁵ See § 13. n. 50.

can hardly be recognised under the varnish with which the practice of ascribing to them so much of the good and evil of aftertimes¹⁶, has disguised the character and history of the earlier ages. But they were yet as remote from the greatness of emancipated national strength, as from the degradation by which it was succeeded; it was not till the time of Cylon, Draco, Solon, and Pisistratus, that an impulse was given to the development of their nobler qualities, and they were universally roused as by an electric spark, by the efforts of Clisthenes and the battle of Marathon. Anciently the Athenians were plain and simple¹⁷, like their land, furnished with a solid groundwork of good qualities¹⁸, and with a certain unsuspecting simplicity in particular; this checked the desire of innovation, and the operation of that credulity¹⁹ by which it was promoted, and from the rustic way of life, which lasted till the commencement of the Peloponnesian war²⁰, they were less exposed to temptation and danger. Hence, we behold internal tranquillity till about the year 600 before Christ, barren annals for the space of five

¹⁶ See the perverted opinion of Heracl. Pont. concerning their luxury, Athen. 12, 512. B. C; comp. Diod. Fragm. 4. 41. Bipont.

¹⁷ And in the main points this continued to be the case till a late period, Athen. 4. 137. F.

¹⁸ Plato de Leg. 1. 642. D.: — ὅσοι Ἀθηναίων εἰσὶν ἀγαθοί, διαφερόντως εἰσὶ τοιοῦτοι, — μόνοι γὰρ ἄνευ ἀνάγκης, αὐτοφυῶς, θεία μοῖρα, ἀληθῶς καὶ οὐτι πλαστῶς εἰσὶν ἀγαθοί, applies to the primitive ages. The same may be said of the proverbial Ἀτικκὴ πίστις. See Diogenian. 2. 80; comp. Isocrat. Areop. 243. ed Lang. on the capacity of Athens to produce brave men.

¹⁹ Did they consider the Φύη of Pisistratus to be Athene, as stated in Herod. 1. 60? We shall be enabled to estimate at its true value the opinion of Herodotus, by examining one conceived in a similar spirit, 8. 132. that Samos had seemed to the Greek fleet which had conquered at Salamis, as distant as the Pillars of Hercules. Levesque, Etud. 2. 375. says the Φύη was an allegorical representation of the protection of Athene, through which, Pisistratus wished the Athenians to believe, he had effected his return.

²⁰ Thucyd. 2. 14. 16.

hundred years, peace with the neighbours, indifference to the allurements of the adjacent sea, and even few traces of any feeling for science or art. On the other hand, the political life of the Chalcidians and Eretrians, descended from a common stock with the Athenians, is at an early period beheld in great activity and vigour; domestic riches were exhibited in equestrian pageants and public games²¹, and colonies were assiduously sent out to neighbouring as well as remote islands and coasts. Amongst the Ionians who migrated to Asia a most fruitful germ unfolded itself, in conformity to the natural conditions of their new seats, and expanded into a system presenting extensive and diversified materials for consideration.

Amongst those tribes, which in pursuance of the Doric migration, left their original seats, we must add, to the Athenians and Arcadians, the Achæans. Undisturbed and secluded, they led a life of simplicity in their new home, alike free from dissensions, and uncorrupted by luxury, not entirely averse to navigation and the foundation of distant colonies, but upon the whole, their condition at no time became divested of its negative character. The Acarnanians may be compared with the Achæans in open-heartedness and stability²²; but their political advancement was never considerable, and they even partook of the rapaciousness which marked their neighbours the Ætolians²³. These

²¹ Strab. 10. 448; Hesiod. Op. et Di. 652, sqq.; Pind. Ol. 13. 158; I. 1. 82; Dicaearch. ap Gronov. 11. 33. calls the Chalcidians of his time φιλαπόδημοι, γραμματικοί, and observes: *μεγάλην εὐλήφασιν ἔξιν τοῦ φέρειν ῥαθύμως τὰ προσπίπτοντα*.

²² Polyb. 4. 30. 1: *καὶ γὰρ ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ στάσιμον ἔχουσι τι καὶ φιλελεύθερον*. Their *fides* is commended by Liv. 33. 16.

²³ Thucyd. 1. 5.

appear to have occupied a very low position in the scale of civilisation, and were so estranged from the great body of the Grecian nation, that they can scarcely be recognised as belonging to it²⁴; they were moreover not without barbarian admixture²⁵, and till the time of Polybius were violent and lawless marauders²⁶, who, in their native land, continued no less rude than free till the time of the Romans, only becoming connected with the nobler tribes of Greece in their character of mercenaries²⁷. This delineation is no less applicable to the Ozolian Locrians²⁸, who were in fact afterwards included amongst the Ætoliens²⁹. The Eleans, amongst whom the majority of the governing body were of Ætolian origin, can by no means be considered as sacred and guiltless in the early age; a domineering disposition is their most prominent characteristic; afterwards they became notorious for their drunkenness and falsehood³⁰. Nothing peculiar is commemorated of the Locrians of Opus and Cnemus; the Phocians are only described as the steadfast opponents of the Thessalians; but the inhabitants of Crissa, we know not with what justice, are accused of having committed outrages upon the Delphian pilgrims³¹. Amongst the inhabitants of the Thessalian mountains a warlike disposition similar to that of the Arcadians, entitles the Malians³² to distinct mention.

²⁴ The Ætolian Eurytians are called by Thucyd. 3. 94. ἀγνωστότατοι γλῶσσαν, and ὠμοφάγοι.

²⁵ By means of a transposition into the heroic age, Euripides, Phœn. 138. justly gives Tydeus barbarian armour. Comp. Schol. and Tietz. ad Lycoph. 794.

²⁶ Polybius, 1. 49; 2. 45. 46; 4. 3. 67; 17. 4. 5. "Ἀγεῖν λάφυρον ἀπὸ λαφύρου was general. Comp. Liv. 34. 24.

²⁷ Thucyd. 7. 57.

²⁸ Thucyd. 1. 5.

²⁹ Paus. 10. 28. 1.

³⁰ Polemon, ap. Athen. 10. 442. E.

³¹ See below § 24.

³² Aristot. Polit. 4. 10. 10.

Of those tribes which were not recognised till after the heroic age, the Thessalians are the first in order of time. By lineage only half Greeks, they exhibited themselves during the whole of their political existence in the light of an intruding and ignoble race. It is impossible to determine what innate tendency to their only excellence, the art of riding, or what roots of their subsequent corruption they brought with them. They present the spectacle of barbarians, who, dwelling in a fruitful and smiling land, try in vain to grow familiar with the spontaneous soil³³; they revelled with sensuality in the productions of the conquered province, whilst they were always seen on horseback, and conducted themselves as though they were but the temporary occupants of the fields they ravaged. The ground-colours for their picture, as it appears in the later historical age, are faithlessness³⁴, incontinence, and debauchery³⁵, proneness to a disgraceful traffic in their fellow-men³⁶, and gross superstition³⁷.

The Bœotians, nourished by an equally rich and luxuriant soil, somewhat resembled them in the

³³ Alexander ordered some Thessalian captives to be put in chains, because they had served as mercenaries, instead of cultivating their beautiful country. Plut. Apophtheg. 6. 688. R.

³⁴ Ποικίλοι τὰ ἦθη, Θεσσαλῶν σόφισμα and νόμισμα, Schol. Eurip. Phœn. 1426; Zenob. 4. 29; Vatic. app. 4. 6; Ἀπιστοὶ Θεσσαλοί, Eurip. Fragm. inc. 194; comp. Demosth. Olynth. 1. 15; in Aristocr. 657; where indeed political hatred has a share in the censure; whereas Herac. Pont. ap. Athen. 14. 624. E. ascribes to them the οὐ πανούργον, ἀλλὰ ἐξηρμένον καὶ τε θαρρόηκός, with as little reason as he makes them the forefathers of the Ætolians, 624. C.

³⁵ Plato. Criton, 53. D.; Crates, ap. Athen. 10. 418. C. sqq.; comp. 4. 137. D.; 12. 527. A. and also Heracl. Pont. ap. Athen. 14. 624. E.

³⁶ Aristoph. Plut. 52; Hermipp. ap. Athen. 1. 27. F. Pagasæ was a slave market.

³⁷ Thessaly was the home of Magic, Plin. H. N. 30. 1; Antholog. 3. 172; Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 746. Compare my dissertation on Magic in the Athenæum, 2. 241.

darker shades of their character, although not wholly destitute of the seeds of virtue; they delighted in bodily excitement, violence, and fighting³⁸; the elation of strength and fearlessness³⁹ involved the Bœotian in frequent encounters in the palæstra⁴⁰. The seductions of the table he was unable to resist⁴¹. But a counterpoise in the capacity—of rising to nobler qualities is presented by his self-confidence⁴², his feeling for the charms of music⁴³, for beauty⁴⁴, and for feminine delicacy and grace, which nature had so liberally bestowed on the Bœotian women⁴⁵. Finally, but a very small share⁴⁶ of what was termed the Bœotian evil fame⁴⁷, and which must be understood as chiefly applicable to the Thebans⁴⁸, in all probability devolves to the honourable Thespians⁴⁹, the brave Platæans, and the hospitable Tanagræans⁵⁰.

³⁸ Ephor. ap. Strab. 9. 401; Aristot. Rh. 3. 4; Dicæarch. in Gronov. thes. XI. 26.: *θρασεῖς — καὶ ὑβρισταὶ καὶ ὑπερήφανοι πλήκται τε καὶ ἀδιάφοροι πρὸς πάντα ξένον καὶ δημότην. Κατανωτισταὶ παντὸς δικαίου πρὸς τὰ ἀμφισβатуύμενα τῶν συναλλαγμάτων οὐ λόγῳ συνιστάμενοι, τὴν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ θράσους καὶ τῶν χειρῶν προσάγοντες βίαν, κ. τ. λ.*

³⁹ *Pingues et valentes*, Cicero de Fat. 4; comp. Diod. 15. 39.

⁴⁰ Ephor. ap. Steph. Byz. *Βοιωτία*.

⁴¹ The Comic Poets ap. Athen. 10. 418, sqq.; comp. 4. 148. E, sqq.; Polyb. 6. 23; 20. 4; *Ἀδδηφαγία*, see Plut. Symp. 8. 515; comp. Müller, Orch. 408. 409.

⁴² Dicæarch. ubi sup. *μεγαλόψυχοι καὶ θαυμαστοὶ ταῖς κατὰ τὸν βίον εὐελπιστίαις (εὐπιστίαις)*.

⁴³ They enjoyed the preeminence in the art of flute playing. See on the column erected in memory of this, Dion. Chrys. 1. 263.

⁴⁴ Ælian, V. H. 4. 4. there was a law for artists in Thebes: *εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον τὰς εἰκόνας μιεῖσθαι*.

⁴⁵ Dicæarch. ubi sup.

⁴⁶ The character of the Bœotians as drawn by themselves in Dicæarch. ubi sup. is however to this effect: *τὴν μὲν αἰσχροκέρδιαν κατοικεῖν ἐν Ὠρώπῳ, τὸν δὲ φθόνον ἐν Τανάγρα, τὴν φιλονεικίαν ἐν Θεσπιαῖς, τὴν ὕβριν ἐν Θήβαις, τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἐν Ἀνθηδόνῃ, τὴν περιεργίαν ἐν Κορωνείᾳ, ἐν Πλαταιαῖς τὴν ἀλαζονείαν, τὸν πυρετὸν ἐν Ὀγχήστῳ, τὴν ἀναίσθησίαν ἐν Ἀλιάρτῳ*.

⁴⁷ *Βοιωτία ὕς*, Pind. Ol. 6. 152; Boeckh. expl. 152; Fragg. 51. p. 584; Boeckh. *Βοιώτειον οὗς* Diogenian. 3. 46; comp. Etym. M. *ἐγκτῆνες*, a name of the Bœotians, *διὰ τὸ κτηνώδεις εἶναι καὶ χοιρώδεις*.

⁴⁸ E. g. Demosth. de Coron. 237; *ἀναλγησία, βαρύτης*, 240; *ἀναίσθητοι Θηβαῖοι*, c. Lept. 490; *Θηβαῖοι φρονοῦσιν ἐπ' ὀμότητι καὶ πονηρίᾳ*.

⁴⁹ Strab. 10. 447.

⁵⁰ Dicæarch. ubi sup. 19.

The Dorians. If we are at any time authorised to reason back from subsequent modifications as to an original germ, it must be from the Spartans to the ancient Dorians. By so doing we recognise as the primitive characteristics of the Dorians, the properties of a sturdy mountain race, which, rude and brave, staunch and wary, faithful to its hereditary manners, and jealous of innovation, represented the healthful stem and trunk of the tree; whilst the ante-Doric Peloponnesians, with the exception of the Arcadians, can only be compared to the withered branches. Thus it is explained how the Doric principle, in many of the phenomena of domestic and political life, became predominant, and succeeded in establishing itself, beyond the limits of its own tribe, as the genuine Greek principle⁵¹; whilst other tribes, long passive, devoid of character, and without any determinate external marks of difference, were superseded by it. For that very reason it has originally no positive term of opposition; for the opposition of the Ionic element, as from the beginning a genuine and indigenous product, whose qualities are represented as liable to a similar estimation and designation in the ancient as the modern age, serves to cast a very perplexing light upon the subject; for by this means objects are opposed to each other, which in reality were to a certain extent only coexistent, and this is immediately applied to both races in a larger extent and universally, at the same time that, in fact, the strictly Doric principle can only be affirmed of Sparta and during a limited space of

⁵¹ Thus Plato, *Laches*, 146. D. calls the Doric harmony Greek by pre-eminence.

time, whilst the Ionic, of the same period, can only be understood in reference to the Asiatic Ionians. The opposition is in nowise suited to the ancient Athenians; and after the later Attic manners had become Ionic, Sparta could no longer lay claim to the noblest virtues of the Doric character—simplicity and truth⁵². Now if it should be carried so far as to regard the non-Doric and non-Ionic tribes as appertaining, by virtue of internal affinity, to one of these two masses, herein it is very easy to perceive an abuse of the authority of Thucydides. He beheld the whole of Greece, for the first time, divided into two opposite portions by means of two conflicting hegemonies, one the representative of the Doric, the other of the Ionic name; and saw, politically ranged under two parties, that which it is true was for the most part descended from a kindred stock, but had long ceased to retain any resemblance or affinity in manners and character—or was wholly distinct in origin and descent, but in consequence of political divisions stood side by side, so that by means of a division into two opposite parties of this description, the aggregate Grecian mind appeared to be comprised under these two terms of opposition. But if this classification had been made in conformity to the characteristic qualities of the individual states, the party division would most assuredly have had a very different result.

After these limitations of the inadmissible extension of the Doric and Ionic principles, and without reference to the question how far the individual

⁵² Ἀπλοῦν τι καὶ Δώριον καὶ ἀληθινόν. Plut. Lys. 5.

states of Doric and Ionic extraction may have been contemporaneous ; or in what degree they may have respectively possessed the characteristics of their origin, it must be confessed, some very pointed contrasts may be drawn between them : for instance, the Dorians as a mountain race, the Ionians as a seafaring people ; the former as strictly closed against access from without, the latter as open to the approach of the stranger ; the former constant and steady, the latter unsettled and prone to innovation ; hence the former during a longer period of time unalloyedly Grecian, the latter soon corrupted by foreign admixture⁵³. The more decidedly, therefore, and as it were the more pregnantly, the Doric character was stamped upon the external object, the more liable it was to be retained after its degeneration in individual instances. In fact, in spite of the last circumstance, the exterior of things everywhere preserved a certain general Doric colour, and the single states of the Doric race, without regard to the good or evil attending their development, have upon the whole more strongly-marked distinguishing features than the rest, which is perhaps to be attributed to the strength and decision of the original impression. This was augmented by the fact that the main tribes of the Dorians in their native land remained upon the continent ; whereas the Ionians, as it were, singled out from the rest, grew independent on foreign ground, and by means of their early development, as concerned nationality, became a species of mother nation, which was, nevertheless,

⁵³ Comp. Müll. Dor. 2, 184. 366. 378. 389. 390. 403, sqq.

deficient in parental tenderness and solicitude for its offspring. Lastly, the Doric principle had a firm hold and support in Sparta, the dominant state of the mother country, where it had been developed to the most expressive and permanent forms.

The peculiarity of Sparta consisted in carrying the original peculiarities of the Doric character to an extreme; this very extreme distinguished it from such as were of a common origin with itself. The nature of Laconia was signally adapted to exaggerate the roughness of its inhabitants; and the legislation of Lycurgus developed itself, and operated retrospectively as a purely indigenous element. The spontaneous and natural qualities, which constitute character, were thereby thrown into the shade, and the better impulses made dependent upon the laws⁵⁴. Although the Spartans were not altogether insensible to certain moral impressions, and the love of music was conspicuous amongst them⁵⁵, still the susceptibility of that which penetrates to the inmost recesses of the heart, and the moral sentiment, was wholly wanting. The kindlier feelings still slumbered within them; the intellectual faculties had only unfolded themselves in certain leading directions. This imparted a nobler character to the feelings; but when they strive to clothe themselves in expressive and exalted words, we still discern a certain callousness and contempt for the genuine and unsophisticated features of the human character, a suspicious reserve towards the rest of the Greeks, a barbarous

⁵⁴ Sparta, *δαμασίμβροτος*. Simonid. ap. Plut. Ages. 1.

⁵⁵ Thaletas and Terpander appeared an insurrection by singing. Plut. de Mus. 10. 699; Diod. Frag. 4. 37, Bipont.

degradation of their inferiors, vulgar scoffing, and malignant joy at the misfortunes of others⁵⁶. The inconsiderable advances they had made in civilisation are proved by their slowness to action, and their antiquated simplicity with its scruples. Their dexterity and skill were little else than bodily agility in athletic exercises. A long-continued adherence to prescriptive usages, which, to nearly the same extent, applies to the ancient Athenians, was fitted to produce both good and evil fruits, and as it was continued politically, it must be judged of politically. The Spartan was only bound to life by one description of tie, and this was easily broken: the contempt of death is the most marked feature in his character.

The political institutions of Crete were similar to those of Sparta: but the national character is stigmatised; treachery, mendacity, and sordid cupidity were its taints⁵⁷; no examples of nobler features can be adduced from the historical age; the accounts of the civil virtues and public education of Crete⁵⁸, are the wretched varnish of encomiastic declamation in aftertimes.

The Messenians lie without the range of strictly historical criticism; the land was less wild than Laconia; a milder character in the inhabitants is even implied by their proper names⁵⁹; nevertheless, poetry commemorates their magnanimous, but ineffectual struggle against their oppressor Sparta,

⁵⁶ See Herod. 6. 67, the shameful raillery of Leotyichides at the expense of Demaratus.

⁵⁷ Polyb. 6. 46; 3. 47; Callim. Hymn. ad Jov. 8; and Spanheim. *Κρητιζέειν*, Zenob. 4. 62.

⁵⁸ As Dosiadas ap. Athen. 4. 143, and even Ephor. ap. Strab. 10. 483.

⁵⁹ Comp. Müller, Dor. 1. 99, 100.

the impetuosity of Aristodemus, and the true heroism of Aristomenes.

Argolis was not calculated to produce or to maintain a similarity of character in its inhabitants. The Argives in particular, originally mixed with Ionians⁶⁰, proclaimed their Doric extraction in their taciturnity and brevity of expression⁶¹, their hereditary bravery, and taste for music⁶². The Phliasians, composed of ancient Achæans and Dorians, as well as the inhabitants of Epidaurus, Hermione, Trœzen, and Halieis, sprung from Ionians and Dorians, are only remarkable for their unshaken adherence to Spartan-Doric aristocracy. In Sicyon, the cradle of the Dionysian festivals⁶³, and the birthplace of painting and sculpture⁶⁴, prevailed a cheerful and yielding disposition: a lively character distinguished Tiryns⁶⁵, which did not become free and independent of Argos till late. Ægina, the colony of Epidaurus, was very early distinguished by maritime enterprise, an indomitable spirit of liberty, and the love of plastic art⁶⁶.

Corinth, among the Doric states of the mother country, presents the greatest contrast to Sparta. Its local character, the intercourse of strangers, and its riches, early contributed to produce cor-

⁶⁰ Strab. 8. 374; comp. § 13. n. 40.

⁶¹ Æschyl. Suppl. 203, sqq. 276; Sophocl. Acris. ap. Stob. 74. 325; and Odyss. *μαινομ:* ap. Schol. Pind. Isth. 6. 87; *μῦθος γὰρ Ἀργολιστὶ συντέμνειν βραχύς*.

⁶² Herod. 3. 131; Müller, Dor. 2. 332. Their love of drinking belongs to a later age, Athen. 10. 442. D.; Æl. V. H. 3. 15; and the *Ἀργεῖοι φῶρες*, Vatic. Append. ii. 49; and Suidas, from Aristophan. Anagyros; likewise most probably the sycophantic *Ἀργεῖα φορά*. Diogenian. 2. 79.

⁶³ Herod. 5. 67; comp. Boeckh, Pub. Econ. 2. 362, sqq.

⁶⁴ Plin. H. N. 35. 40; 36. 4.

⁶⁵ Theophr. ap. Ath. 6. 261. D. They are stigmatised as drunkards and cowards in Ath. 10. 442. D.; whether justly or not does not appear.

⁶⁶ Müller, Æginet. 68, sqq.

ruption of manners⁶⁷; but here, too, we find combined with great sagacity in practical inventions⁶⁸, a powerful impulse to navigation and the founding of states, although this was in some measure first called into action under the tyranny of the Cypselidæ.

Megara, lastly, was, in its good old times, like its parent town Corinth, most active in undertaking distant voyages and founding colonies⁶⁹; afterwards it became puffed up with the most ridiculous vanity⁷⁰. After the Persian wars, however, it is only exhibited in the Attic raillery, which was directed against the littleness of mind produced by its habits of trade, and penurious disposition⁷¹.

The aspect which the Grecian national character assumed upon foreign ground presents this singular phenomenon in the history of mankind, that the Greeks bore with them from their mother country to the most remote settlements, a system which was so matured and dependent upon its own roots for strength and sustenance, that its peculiar impress did not become effaced in the midst of barbarians till after the universal destruction of Grecian independence; at the same time the language and manners of Greece universally pervaded the land of the barbarians, and the former became the general language of the east after the

⁶⁷ Strab. 8. 378; Athen. 13. 573; Plato, de Repub. 3. 404; Diodor. Fragm. 4. 14, Bipont.

⁶⁸ See on the subject of these Boeckh, explicat. Pind. 215.

⁶⁹ "Υβρις, in Theognis, is in nowise conclusive, but the *παλιντοκία*, and the *ἀμαζοκυλιστάι*, Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 183, 213, prove it.

⁷⁰ See Theocr. 14. 48, and in the Schol. the enquiry on the part of the Megarians as to their rank, comp. Photius, 'Υμεῖς ὦ Μεγαρ. However, according to Zenob. 1. 48, Diogen. 1. 47, and Suidas, *Αἰγυεῖς*, the Ægians received the response, but it seems very questionable.

⁷¹ Ps. Demosth. c. Near. 1357. 8; comp. Dem. c. Aristocr. 691. 4. *Μεγαρικὰ μηχανά*, Aristoph. Acharn. 738.

Greeks themselves had become subject to foreign despots. But the influence of the physical character of new regions called various new faculties into existence. The Greeks appropriated to themselves the most fertile tracts of country on the Mediterranean and the Pontus, the territory of Carthage only excepted; the greatest part of these regions were blest by nature with fertility and abundance, replete with the inducements to physical enjoyment, amply remunerative of industry, and signally calculated to diminish it by superfluity. But the ocean became their favourite element, and the new states, judiciously availing themselves of the local advantages presented to them, all founded on islands or coasts where strips of land facilitated fortification on the inland side, and sheltered bays and havens rendered the sea secure and inviting, raised themselves, almost without exception, to maritime trade, and in some instances to maritime supremacy. This diminished the necessity of obtaining provisions from the immediately adjacent districts; their course lay over the waves, the eye was averted from the interior of countries and the barbarians who dwelt there. Against these they were chiefly secured by the separation which had long prevailed among them, and which afterwards generally led to the rise of powerful states, when the Greeks had long attained maturity, and in many instances had outlived it. Where force was unavailing, the art of rendering themselves beloved and respected by their neighbours enabled them to obtain admittance amongst them. The contact with barbarian manners and its influence could not indeed be avoided. The Grecian settlements were,

it is true, exceedingly numerous; but the continuity of the land territory was almost everywhere kept up by narrow strips of sea-coast alone, or was altogether wanting; that alone served to render the natural bond amongst these states without the mother country an extremely loose one; add to this, that the long continuance of peaceable intercourse with their neighbours, and the absence of aggression from active and warlike enemies did not allow a firm and faithful observance of native manners and customs, or a marked contrast to those of foreign countries to operate in their full force. In the interior of the new transmarine states, national life grew in very few from a simple germ, as the population of the greater part of them was a mixed one from their earliest foundation, or, at all events, became so through the emigrants who arrived afterwards. Now although these manifold ingredients were all of Grecian blood, still the peculiarity of a particular tribe could not maintain itself in its former purity and exclusion. On that account, under a general Grecian surface, we behold deviations both from the characteristics of those members of a tribe who had remained in the mother country, and even more or less an approximation to the barbarian character, which, for the most part, occurred more rapidly than changes of a similar description in the parent country. Here, likewise, we are only enabled to glance at the chief phenomena.

The inhabitants of the Cyclades, in their aspiring and youthful nature, displayed no less cheerfulness and vivacity than energy of character. Surrounded by the most seductive attractions of nature, they

advanced for a long time upon the right path, fostering and augmenting strength with a wise measure of enjoyment, but cautiously avoiding the pernicious effects of excess⁷². The Ionians at first display considerable activity and enterprise; the rough inhabitants of Colophon were bold horsemen⁷³; the Milesians intrepid and manly⁷⁴, and, as has been already remarked, they exhibited great alacrity in traffic, navigation, and the establishment of colonies; the Chians powerful by sea⁷⁵, as well as the Samians, who were bold sailors, and extended their voyages to the pillars of Hercules⁷⁶. However, the Ionians, at their very first establishment, had been debased, by foreign alloy, from their union with the wives of the former inhabitants of the country⁷⁷; both dress⁷⁸ and language underwent a change; the latter probably originally possessed the fundamental forms correspondent to its subsequent softness, and they can hardly at any time have been so thin as the Attic. Nature exercised her siren power upon them: herein she was aided by the voluptuous neighbours of the Greeks, especially the Lydians⁷⁹, and the Ionians might then, as afterwards, be justly described as distinguished by enervating luxury⁸⁰, the softest beds⁸¹, and the

⁷² Σιφνιάζειν, Phot. The vices ascribed to Leros (Strab. 10. 487,) etc. must probably be referred to a later age.

⁷³ Σκληροί, Phylarch. ap. Ath. 12. 526. A. See on this point Mimnermus ap. Stob. 7. 87, Orl. ed.

⁷⁴ Πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι, a proverb in Ath. 12. 525; Zenob. 5. 80. ⁷⁵ Strab. 14. 645; Herod. 6. 15; 16. 26, sqq.

⁷⁶ Herod. 4. 152.

⁷⁷ Herod. 1. 146.

⁷⁸ Ἰάονες ἐλκεχίτωνες, Homer, Hymn. Apoll. 147. On the flowing robes of the Samians, see Asiatic ap. Ath. 12. 525. F.

⁷⁹ Athen. 12. 525. 526.

⁸⁰ Ἰωνικὸν τρυφερόν· ἐπὶ τούτῳ γὰρ ἐκωμωδοῦντο οἱ Ἴωνες, Hesych. Ἰωνικόν· ἡ τρυφερά καὶ καλλιτράπεζος Ἰωνία Athen. 12. 524, F; γέλως Ἰωνικός, Vatican. append. i. 45; comp. Ath. 14. 623, and Heracl. Pont. ibid. 625. B; Aristoph. Thesm. 170, and Schol. Eccles. 913, etc.; Callinus

most fragrant ointments⁸². Colophon is said to have been the first to degenerate⁸³; but it is highly probable that Ephesus was still sooner the seat of Asiatic licentiousness⁸⁴, which revelled⁸⁵ to such a degree there, as to generate a spirit of hostility to such as were uncorrupted⁸⁶. The Milesians, who were easily inflamed⁸⁷, and whose folly is not to be attributed to a want of judgment, sunk into the most enervating effeminacy⁸⁸; Chios was the first amongst the Greek states to carry on the slave trade⁸⁹, and afterwards deserved obloquy by delivering up Pactyes from his asylum⁹⁰; however, even in the midst of corruption it still retained its activity⁹¹; Samos was called the "soft"⁹², in consequence of its effeminate manners.

The course of development amongst the Æolians of Asia, composed of old Achæans, and Bœotian and Thessalian Æolians was similar. Cuma, indeed, displayed, during ages, the same unsuspecting and artless character⁹³ as the Achæans of the Peloponnesian north coast; but Lesbos sunk into the most degrading voluptuousness; the nature of the country rendered the inhabitants its slaves;

(Olymp. 1.) censures the corruption which even in his time began to characterise them. See Stobæus, cap. 49. 355, ed. Aurel.

⁸¹ On Miletus and Chios, Critias ap. Ath. 1. 28. B.

⁸² Concerning Ephesus, Ath. 15. 689. A.

⁸³ Ath. 12. 526. A. sqq.

⁸⁴ According to the Etym. M. and Suidas, *Δαιρίς* was a Lydian shopkeeper in the city at the time of its first occupation, and from him it derived its name(?).

⁸⁵ Ath. 12. 525. C. sqq.

⁸⁶ Their declaration at the expulsion of Hermodorus, *ἡμέων μηδεὶς ὀνήϊστος ἔστω, εἰ δὲ μή, ἄλλη καὶ μετ' ἄλλων*, Strab. 14. 642, can, however, scarcely be considered a real decree. Heraclitus said they all deserved to be hanged for it. Diog. Laert. 9. 2.

⁸⁷ Heracl. ap. Ath. 14. 625. B; comp. 442. B.

⁸⁸ See Rambach de Mileto, p. 21. 22.

⁸⁹ Athen. 6. 265. 266.

⁹⁰ Herod. 1. 154; Paus. 4. 35. 6.

⁹¹ Aristoph. Ran. 171; Athen. 1. 25. F.

⁹² *Ἀβρά*, see Ath. 12. 526. E. sqq.; 540. 541; Panofka res Sam. 77-80.

⁹³ Strab. 13. 622.

lust and drunkenness held them in bonds⁹⁴. The corruption spread still farther northward. It is probable that it is not only afterwards that Abydos merited severe censure⁹⁵.

Rhodes alone shines forth from the darkness which envelops the Doric colonies in the east, and exhibits some illustrious names⁹⁶; the composed seriousness⁹⁷ which was, till a late era, commended in the people, justifies us in assuming that its Doric character had, in the main features, sustained no change. Iassus⁹⁸ resembled it. From the want of records we are unable to form an estimate of the Minyan-Doric Thera; its daughter-state, Cyrene, was at a very early date corrupted by Libyan-Egyptian influence⁹⁹; the art of chariot-driving¹⁰⁰ is the solitary excellence attributed to the Cyrenæans.

It was long before any of the towns on the coast of Thrace distinguished themselves by marked peculiarities. Abdera and Maronea had the reputation of being simple¹⁰¹, like Cuma; Byzantium was said to be corrupted by the spirit of trade¹⁰², like Corinth. But all enquiries relative to the Grecian political system in the Pontic states, as well as their own in its subsequent degeneracy, are fruitless.

On the other hand, the west exhibits, in striking

⁹⁴ Athen. 10. 438. 442. The law of Pittacus, which annexed a double penalty to such crimes as were committed in a state of intoxication, gives us an insight into their character, Aristot. Ethic. Nic. 3. 9. 8; Rhet. 1. 2. 25; Polit. 2. 9. 9.

⁹⁵ See Ath. 12. 524. F; comp. Steph. Byz. "Αβυδοί, Zenob. 1. 1.

⁹⁶ The Diagorids. Pind. Ol. 7; Boeckh, expl. Pind. 165, sqq.

⁹⁷ Dion. Chrys. 1. 359. 377. R. ed.

⁹⁸ Heracl. Pont. 39; Boeckh, Minos, 55.

⁹⁹ See Thrige, Hist. Cyrenes, 268. 269.

¹⁰⁰ Ephor. ap. Steph. Byz. Βιωτία; comp. Βάρκη.

¹⁰¹ Ps. Demosth. de Pact. Alexand. 218; ὥσπερ ἐν Ἀβδηρίταις ἡ Μαρωνίταις πολιτευόμενοι.

¹⁰² Aristot. Pol. 3. 4. 1; Damon. ap. Ath. 10. 442. C.

colours, the expansion of youthful vigour, combined with fearlessness and audacity; in these states, too, as in Ionia and Æolis, we recognise, in the early tendency to the unbridled enjoyments of the senses, a precocity that outstripped the mother-country, and they may be compared to a scion of the mother-stem transplanted into a hothouse, which attains maturity and withers before its time. Corcyra soon became familiar with the sea, and grew powerful upon it, haughtily bidding defiance to its parent city, Corinth¹⁰³; nor can a very favourable opinion be entertained of the manners of the early age; a turbulent, faithless¹⁰⁴, and seditious character eventually proved its destruction. Syracuse inspires as little respect as Corcyra; the Syracusan table passed into a proverb¹⁰⁵; but the combination of the Corinthian character with that of the ingenious and wily Siculian, produced a certain racy vivacity¹⁰⁶, which afterwards caused the Syracusans to be compared to the Athenians¹⁰⁷. In Agrigentum nothing more is to be discerned in the old records than the character of the tyranny. In later times the stigma of drunkenness rests upon Leontini¹⁰⁸. Sybaris, branded in history for its licentious debauchery¹⁰⁹, although its name may have been frequently misapplied, and it is necessary to sift truth from falsehood¹¹⁰, will ever be a memorial to prove, that innocence and purity, unless accompanied by strength, are of no avail against the fascinations of

¹⁰³ Thucyd. 1. 97.

¹⁰⁴ Δίχα θυμὸν ἔχουσι, Hermipp. ap. Ath. 1. 27. F.

¹⁰⁵ Zenob. 5. 74.

¹⁰⁶ Cic. c. Verr. 2. 4. 43.

¹⁰⁷ Thucyd. 8. 96.

¹⁰⁸ Diogenian. 2. 50.

¹⁰⁹ Athen. 12. 518. C. sqq.; comp. Blanchard, sur les Sybarites, in the Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript. vol. ix.

¹¹⁰ Heyne, Opusc. 2. 131.

pleasure—to such a degree could Achæans degenerate! On the contrary, Crotona, descended from the same tribe, rose through the efforts of Pythagoras, for a certain space of time, to virtue and honour, and never shared the errors of Sybaris. Tarentum, too, seems, for a time, to have resisted the temptations of its voluptuous climate; however, an original dereliction of Laconian austerity is, perhaps, to be traced to the character of its founders, the Parthenians, whom the *Mythus* has misrepresented. Locri and Rhegium, governed by good laws, long respected, honest citizenship, the Rhegians are most unjustly taxed with cowardice, which imputation has been cast upon them by the malice of the elder Dionysius¹¹¹. Cuma and Naples were very early exposed to danger from the vicinity of rude neighbours. The embassy of the Cumæans to the Roman senate, for permission to make use of the Latin language in public debates and proclamations¹¹², although late, still took place too soon. Naples remained Grecian for a longer period of time¹¹³. Massilia, finally, little acquainted or connected by friendly relations with the rest of the Greeks, and very early in intercourse with Rome, is nevertheless recorded as having been constant to Grecian manners¹¹⁴, attached to civil order¹¹⁵, industrious and noble-minded¹¹⁶, whilst no Ionic state presents a picture of equal stability.

¹¹¹ Photius, 'Πηγίν; Hesych. and Suid. 'Πηγίν and Λάγως; comp. Zenob. 4. 85; 5. 83; Diogenian. 7. 97. ¹¹² Liv. 40. 42.

¹¹³ Strab. 5. 248.

¹¹⁴ Liv. 37. 54.

¹¹⁵ Comp. Johannsen, veter. Massil. res 72, sqq.

¹¹⁶ Ibidem, 42, sqq.

CONSTITUTIONS AND EXTERNAL POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE GRECIAN STATES.

THE HEROIC AGE.

I. RISE OF THE GRECIAN STATES. THE VARIOUS CLASSES: CITIZENS, SLAVES, ALIENS— NOBLES—AND COMMON FREEMEN.

§ 16. In an account of the political constitutions of the heroic age, it is indispensably necessary to institute an enquiry into the commencement of Grecian political life in general, and to ascertain whether the oldest Grecian states were the offspring of natural necessity, existing without the instrumentality of a creative idea, or whether they resulted from preconceived design and self-conscious and systematic agency. The notion, that the earliest political communities in general had been associated after a previous compact on the part of their members, long found zealous supporters; it must likewise be acknowledged, that the absence of consciousness which marked the proceedings of the primitive inhabitants of the earth must very soon have ceased: nevertheless to

assume an agreement with a view to political society, before the commencement and trial of the same, is nearly tantamount to the proposition of Lord Monboddo, which affirms, that language was the result of an agreement entered into for the purpose of calling it into existence.

On the other hand, when the notion of the instinctiveness of a life of nature is properly limited, it may be called a dependence of the primitive inhabitants of the earth, upon the conditions and dispensations of nature; a state, though not divested of reflection, still incapable of carrying into execution the results of pure speculation, wherein, however, the incipient operation of intelligence and design is perceptible in the early attempt to observe certain uniform phenomena in a diversity of cases, and to draw from the same a rule and standard of prescription, which might enable them to pursue a sure course amidst the endless vicissitudes of human affairs; hence, the assertion of Aristotle, that the state arose out of a gradually extending family, of which it is the transcript¹, will be found generally accurate, and especially applicable to the origin of the Grecian states. A condition similar to that of families, and not tending to political union, in which each father of a family governed his children alone, without standing in intimate connection with the neighbouring circles, is ascribed by Homer to the Cyclops²; but that the Grecian states were developed from family unions, is attested by the political form of those unions which existed till a very late age in several provinces of Greece,

¹ Polit. 1. 1. 7.

² Od. 9. 112, sqq.; comp. Aristot. ubi sup.

and are even mentioned by Homer³, as well as by corresponding illustrations of the same by approved investigators of antiquity⁴. Their natural source therefore was a participation in the growing political unions formed by the confederation of families, with which was very soon combined the joint performance of sacrifices as an intimate tie of another description. But the development of this infancy of things to the point where the characteristics of the state begin to appear manifestly could not take place, without various modifications arising from external contact and admixture. For that, together with the natural-born member of the union, the stranger also attained his fixed sphere and rights by means of naturalisation, is clearly implied in the legends of migrations, marriages, and adoptions of the heroes; whilst in the march of development the aggregation of unions, which had already become extended into tribes, led to the formation of a league, or a still more closely cemented union, a political society properly so called.

The notion of citizenship at first only existed so far, as the condition of aliens and domestic slaves was its negative; at this stage the nobility and the lower class of people alone attract attention as essentially distinct ingredients of the union, and as subject to different laws. How early a difference arose in personal rank, history does not inform us; that it originated from circumstances and not through compact, is self-evident. The poetic legend recounts no rising of the nobles out of the

³ Il. 2. 362. 363.: κρῖν' ἀνδρας κατὰ φύλα, κατὰ φρήτρας, Ἀγάμεμνον, κ. τ. λ.

⁴ See Appendix vii.

mass; it forges links between the heroic and the divine races; but between the heroes and the populace, it interposes a chasm which forbids them to commingle.

A politically recognised rank in the common freemen, and legal rights in an individual of the lower order, flowing from and guaranteed by it, are notions unknown to the poetry of heroic antiquity (*); he whom the circle of the heroic nobility did not comprehend within it, occupied an intermediate station between wavering and not legally-guaranteed independence and cliental servitude. The aggregate mass of the lower order was attached to the nobility, who were supported and raised by it to heroic life and action. A primitive mark of distinction was that the nobility resided in the citadel, and the lower class in the country; hence their denomination *Demus*⁵, still this demus was not expressly deprived of a legal station, and the infancy of citizenship is specifically exhibited in its participating in the public administration of justice⁶, which may at least be assumed in matters of litigation between those of equal rank, as well as in its presence at the public assembly as a body of armed warriors⁷.

Thereby a line of demarcation was drawn between the mere citizen, and slaves and foreigners. The first, either prisoners of war⁸, or purchased from kidnappers⁹; in both cases Greeks, as well as barbarians, pertained to the domestic economy

[* See Appendix iv. Trans.]

⁵ See Append. viii.

⁶ Hom. Il. 18. 497.

⁷ *Λαοί*, *ibid.* See Append. viii.

⁸ Hom. Od. 1. 398. *Δμῶς*, *δμωός*, *δμωή* from *δαμάω*.

⁹ Od. 1. 430; 15. 482.

of individuals¹⁰, and but few appear to have been affected by slavery¹¹, as a state of misery brought about by violent means; it was confined to them as individuals; its propagation, by means of marriages amongst the slaves, was at least not regular¹²; but the reduction of earlier races to a state of bondage, as was afterwards the case with the Penestæ and the Helots, cannot be proved with any certainty; however the inhabitants of those places which the Atridæ seem to designate as their private property, might serve as examples¹³.

Slaves of war were manumitted in consideration of a ransom¹⁴; the naturalisation of such as were enfranchised, and did not return to their country, is not recorded in the nature of an expressly defined relation¹⁵.

The law of aliens¹⁶ was defined with tolerable accuracy. Emigrants indeed were little esteemed in general¹⁷, and not accounted partakers of legal rights out of their own country; still, by virtue of the divine law, protection was extended to them, and especially to such as stood in need of assistance. For in general, although the robberies which were so frequently committed¹⁸ might have excited suspicion, and a notion that it was expedient to treat every stranger as an enemy,

¹⁰ Δμῶες μάλα μυρίοι, Od. 17. 422.

¹¹ Ἦμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς, ἀποαίνονται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς, κ. τ. λ. Od. 17. 322.

¹² Enfranchised slaves seem to have been allowed to marry, Od. 14. 64; 21. 214.

¹³ Hom. Il. 9. 149; Od. 4. 175.

¹⁴ Ἀποινα, Il. 1. 13; 10. 380.

¹⁵ Od. 21. 215. Ulysses wishes to make the shepherds associates of Telemachus.

¹⁶ This refers to those strangers only, ξένοι, with whom no treaties of hospitality had been entered into.

¹⁷ — ἀτίμητον μετανάστην, Il. 9. 644; 16. 59; comp. Tittmann, gr. Staatsv. 645.

¹⁸ See the question in the Od. 3. 73; 9. 252. whether the unknown is a pirate?

personal security was so far recognised and established within the territories of states, that every foreigner who presented himself in a peaceful manner was regarded as entitled to the hospitality of bed and board¹⁹, and the protection by which it was accompanied²⁰. This was secured upon the public faith²¹, as both the royal citadel afforded the guarantee of the state to the stranger who found a reception in it, besides which shelter²² and accommodation²³ were provided publicly; and these were most probably claimed by the following persons in addition to the heroes, viz., foreign workmen²⁴, soothsayers expressly summoned, priests, artists, and physicians²⁵, and lastly heralds²⁶, who, as such, were already regarded as within the pale of protection. Merchants²⁷ and beggars²⁸ traversed the country alike exempt from danger. Hospitality was finally exhibited in its greatest force in the treatment of those who, strictly speaking, were a kind of outlaws, fugitives from their country, and the victims of persecution, when they became suppliants for help²⁹. They were supposed to be under the especial care of Zeus during their flights³⁰, as well as when imploring protec-

¹⁹ Od. 4. 26, sqq.

²⁰ Il. 9. 636; 21. 76; Od. 8. 208; compare on ἄλεις and τραπέζαι, Demosth. de. fals. Legat. 400. 6; and Æschin. in Ctesiph. 616. R. ed. Concerning the impiety of Hercules, who slew his guest Iphitus, and his atonement, see Od. 21. 27, sqq.; Diod. 4. 31; Plut. Thes. 6.

²¹ Od. 1. 119; 3. 34; 19. 197.

²² In the λείσχη, Od. 18. 328, or ἐν χαλκητῷ δόμῳ, 327.

²³ Od. 19. 197; δημόθεν ἄλφιστα δῶκα καὶ αἶθοπα οἶνον ἀγείρας.

²⁴ Θῆτες, Od. 4. 644; 18. 356; Il. 21. 444.

²⁵ Od. 17. 383—385.

²⁶ Od. 19. 135.

²⁷ Od. 15. 414.

²⁸ Od. 6. 207; 14. 58.

²⁹ ἵκεται.

³⁰ Ζεὺς φύξιος, Apollod. 1. 9. 1; λαφύστιος, amongst the Bœotian Orchomenians, Paus. 1. 24. 2; Schol. Apollon. Rh. 2. 655; 4. 699; Tzetz. Lycophr. 288; comp. Müller, Orch. 164.

tion³¹; extradition was never thought of³²; regular sanctuaries, however, appear to belong to a later age.

The members of the aristocracy were either designated the old³³, or the pre-eminent³⁴, the best³⁵. In considering the various significations of the word *Heros*³⁶, our attention must be directed to the two extremes of the scale. In its most exalted meaning, the hero derives his origin from Olympus, or is received into it upon the completion of his earthly career; in the earthly sense, every one is a hero who, in any respect whatever, rises above the multitude, for instance, the herald³⁷. From this less exalted notion, which bore no reference to political law, flowed the still more comprehensive one of Hesiod³⁸, which comprises the whole human race of the olden time. The first and nobler signification is associated with the political conception of an aristocratic body. Like the hero thus described, that order was totally separated from the lower class of people; the principle of nobility, the exclusive character of the noble families was most rigorously developed. However this distinction of ranks, which in its principal features was solely directed to purity of race and external honour, can by no means be regarded as a caste-like constitution of the Indian or Egyptian

³¹ Ζεὺς ἰκετήσιος, Od. 13. 213; comp. 7. 165. 181; 9. 270.

³² Concerning the Heracleids in Athens, see Pherecyd. ap. Anton. Lib. 33; Sturz. 184. new ed.; Apoll. 2. 8. 1.

³³ Γέροντες, Il. 9. 570; 18. 503; Δημογέροντες, 3. 149; but 2. 789; πάντες ὀμηγέρες, ἡμὲν νέοι, ἡδὲ γέροντες.

³⁴ Il. 2. 188, ὄντινα μὲν βασιλῆα καὶ ἔξοχον ἄνδρα κικεῖη.

³⁵ Ἀριστῆες, Od. 6. 34.

³⁶ See the comprehensive investigation in Creuzer's Symb. 3. 1, sqq.

³⁷ Od. 13. 424; comp. 15. 350, συβώτης ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν, 14. 3, et passim, δῖος ὑφορβός.

³⁸ Op. et Dies. 155, sqq.

kind, which does not turn upon mere nobility or baseness of blood, but involves a separation in the other circumstances of life. This is in nowise applicable to the ancient Grecian orders. The names of the older Attic Phylæ, it is true, seem to indicate a separation in the priesthood, the military body, and the trades: still careful investigation would doubtless prove that the Attic political order of rank did not resemble that of castes³⁹. But Plato's remark, that priests and warriors had once been separate⁴⁰, cannot be understood in reference to the heroic states. In these the high-priesthood was associated with the princely office⁴¹, which had a warlike character. The seers Tiresias and Calchas are separated from the warriors it is true; but this is chiefly to be attributed to the notion the ancients entertained of the prophetic faculty, which distinguished the person in whom it resided from the rest of the people, and was, therefore, transmitted by regular succession in his family⁴²; that this led to no separation of classes is proved in the instance of the soothsayer Melampus, who became king, and of Amphiaraus, who went to the war as a hero mounted on his chariot⁴³. Thus the assumption that sacerdotal families, in which certain worships were hereditary⁴⁴, were not heroic, falls to the ground; and finally, if the priests attached to the direction of certain worships had a peculiar rank in the state, and especial sanctity

³⁹ See § 43 and 44.

⁴⁰ Tim. 24. A.; Critias, 110. C.

⁴¹ Aristot. Pol. 3. 9. 7.

⁴² The chief passage is Od. 15. 224, sqq.

⁴³ The earliest testimony extant is Odyss. ubi sup. Comp. the important passage, Strab. 16. 762.

⁴⁴ *Θυσίαι ἱερὰ καὶ*, Arist. p. 3. 9. 7; 6. 5. 11.

and inviolability pertained to them⁴⁵, this must be explained from the dignity of the office, and the fact that it was generally administered by such as were too old for the service of arms. Moreover, warriors and husbandmen were not separated; the warriors at Troy were landholders in their own country⁴⁶; the particular kind of service they performed, was the only distinction between the nobility and the commonalty. Finally, ingenuity and art, like the divinatory faculty, the personal endowments of individuals, and frequently found transmitted from generation to generation in their families, even in the historical age, were by no means the possession of a particular caste in the state. At that time artists and workmen went into foreign countries in pursuit of gain, and were on that account generally distinguished among the inhabitants of the state, in which they took up their temporary residence by the homeless character assigned to them⁴⁷.

II. THE PRINCELY OFFICE.

§ 17. The fundamental distinction between nobles and princes was that of plurality and unity; there could be but one prince, but several nobles in the state. In the political camp before the walls of Troy, the heroes, for the most part sovereign princes at home, stood towards Agamemnon in the relation of an aristocracy¹. Although in the *Odyssey*² we find princely birth ascribed to

⁴⁵ The Ætolian nobility send the best priests as ambassadors to Meleager. Il. 9. 570.

⁴⁶ Il. 24. 398.

⁴⁷ See n. 25.

¹ Ἀργείων βασιλῆες, ὅσοι κεκλήατο βουλῇν. Il. 10. 195.

² Od. 6. 34.

several noble families in the state of the Phæacians, it was, nevertheless, the most prevalent notion of antiquity, that the nature and unity of the state exclusively depended upon the authority of one prince ; therefore there were as many states as there were princes. Hence the monarchical appears as the prevailing principle, in investigating which, we shall first direct our attention to the princely dignity, without regard to the extent of the powers of government.

The unity of the monarchy had naturally developed itself as a recognised principle from the condition of families ; the authority and the power of the head of the family were continued in those unions which were gradually matured for political society³. But it is manifest that the principle of affinity, as the original fountain from which the head of the family derived his authority, whilst the distance from the root was constantly increasing, could not remain its sole support ; nor could any thing like a presidency in the person of the patriarch of the tribe continue to be the established form of government. This presidency and princely dignity, influenced by various external circumstances, proceeded from the feeling of necessity for a supreme fountain of order and security⁴, and the willingness to confide in the direction of a guide. Now of whatever description may have been those qualities, which in ancient Greece originally conferred princely authority, the wisdom of age, which was so efficacious in pacifying and uniting the turbulent

³ Aristot. Pol. 1. 1. 7.

⁴ Plut. Pelop. 24 ; ὁ γὰρ πρῶτος, ὡς εἶκε, καὶ κυριώτατος νόμος τῷ σώζεσθαι δεομένῳ, τὸν σώζειν δυνάμενον ἄρχοντα κατὰ φύσιν ἀποδίδωσι.

sons of nature⁵, suavity of speech, the heroic strength of youth, beauty⁶, riches, beneficence⁷, or, in one word, according to the expression of Aristotle, excellence⁸, it is certain that one uniform light is thrown upon the princes by the heroic chivalry. A glance at the above described nationality of the Pelasgians, leads us to suppose that a condition similar to that of families, and the peaceful authority of elders, prevailed amongst them. Another state of things arose with the Hellenic chivalric and contentious military chiefs, and this may be compared to the departure of the youth as soon as he is capable of bearing arms. Herewith individuals began to occupy a higher place in the scale of importance in feuds, predatory expeditions, and adventures, especially when chariots began to be employed in battle. From this arose the princely dignity of the heroic times, in a form the more decided the longer the integrity of the family-principle,—the unity of the governing person had already maintained itself during the Pelasgic life of nature. However, in order that the transition may not appear abrupt, it may be necessary to extend our periods here, and the hero who, in the mythical poetry, suddenly emerges from the night of obscurity, must be imagined as the descendant of a long line of forefathers, who passed away without the glory of chivalry. The erection of a citadel may have occasionally marked the com-

⁵ Herod. 1. 69; Strab. 9. 415; Cic. de Offic. 2. 12; De Repub. L. 4. p. 297. Stuttg.; de Legg. 3. 2; and Davis, *ibid*.

⁶ Aristot. Pol. 1. 2. 15; compare the Arcadian tradition in Pausan. 8. 1. 2; *μεγέθει μέντοι καὶ κατὰ ἀλκὴν καὶ κάλλος προεῖρεν ὁ Πελαγὸς καὶ γνῶμην ὑπὲρ τοῦς ἄλλους ἦν, καὶ τούτων ἕνεκα αἰρεθῆναι μοι δοκεῖ βασιλεύειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, and Diodor. 3. 9. on the Ethiopians.

⁷ Aristot. Pol. 5. 8. 5.

⁸ *Ἀρετῇ*, Pol. 3. 10. 7.

mencement of the heroic monarchy; this was the case in the Trojan annals⁹; thus Herodotus states the building of the citadel of Ecbatana, and the foundation of the monarchy to have been contemporaneous. The history of the Hohenstaufen commences nearly in the same manner.

It has been already observed that the authority of these heroic princes was purely monarchical; every Grecian tradition relating to the origin of a state, begins with the unity of a political head; the equality of several in the state was only found in the class below the princely rank; treaties of amity or commerce between several chiefs, themselves formed nothing but a confederation, an *amphictyony*, but not a state. The forcible association of various tribes into a military alliance, under one chieftain, was by no means an unfrequent occurrence. The successive government of the elders of the tribe, which the hymn to Demeter represents as subsisting in Eleusis, is probably to be regarded as a transposition into the heroic age, from the period in which monarchies declined, and the *prytanes* arose.

Unity of the princely dignity is, in the heroic poetry, associated with the family nobility of the princes, transmitted by hereditary succession.

The hereditary principle, by virtue of its natural germ in the early practice of the oldest communities, to regard the merit of an illustrious commander as descendible to his posterity, had taken its rise, and established itself too early to allow us

⁹ Hom. Il. 20. 216; compare Plato. de Legg. 3. 681. E.

¹⁰ Herod. 1. 98.

¹¹ 97. 150—155. 473, sqq.

¹² Hence the *εὐχομαι εἶναι*, see in particular Odyss. 21. 335; *αἶμαρος εἰς ἀγαθοῖο*, Odyss. 4. 611.

to determine its origin with any degree of accuracy. In the heroic poetry, an examination of the claims to princely birth, like the legitimacy of the present day, prevails as public opinion; little importance was attached to its origin; the remembrance of the time previous to its lustre and glory is lost in the darkness of distance. The class of the hero-princes consequently appears as totally closed against the lower orders, as at its origin far above them. This origin was connected with Olympus; the progenitors of the princes were pictured as the sons of gods, and the princely history represented as having its roots in consanguinity with the divine race, so that no new prince could be created on this side of the boundary line, at which this mixture of gods and men terminated. This being referred to the commencement of the national history, a son of one of the gods was fixed upon as the founder of the state¹³, and a people was in various modes assigned to him, which existed solely and exclusively for his sake. From the supposed descent of the princes from the divine race, those personal qualities which were considered essential to their origin, such as strength, beauty¹⁴, and stature¹⁵, were attributed to them; and thus, upon the relationship with the gods, was

¹³ Comp. § 12. n. 20. Pausanias says, with some degree of naïveté, 8. 1. 12, Pelasgus could not have been created *alone* without a people, could he?

¹⁴ Athen. 13. 566. C., τὸ κάλλος βασιλείας οἰκείον ἐστι. That is, why the infamous Ægisthus might still be called ἀμύμων, Od. 1. 29. In the purely heroic spirit, and probably with the same degree of truth, Pindar assigns beauty to the victors in the games, as Ol. 6. 128. Pagano Saggi, 2. 36, explains it thus; “the vigorous youths bore away the fairest virgins; the least beautiful amongst the young women were compelled to mix with the common people.” Finally, is Καλότης βασιλεύς, Hesych. to be explained from this circumstance?

¹⁵ This may be gathered even from the legends concerning relics. See on the subject of Orestes’ coffin, Herod. 1. 68; that of Ajax, Pausan. 1. 35. 3.

established an element that served to ennoble the body. Hence personal strength and stateliness were accounted essential requisites for the princely office, and on that account Neleus refused to acknowledge his lame brother Medon as king¹⁶, which is, however, to be explained from a custom which prevailed within the princely circle itself, not from the operation of anything like an elective power in the people. An analogous notion is that which, in addition to counsel, required strength in action, thus associating authority with heroic strength, and leaving decrepit old age to be neglected and forgotten; for this reason, the shade of Achilles enquires, if the OLD MAN Peleus was less honoured¹⁷, and therefore Achilles in his lifetime is considered as the prince of the Myrmidons¹⁸; this is why Hector is a more prominent figure than Priam; and Nestor, who is still capable of bearing arms, is held up to admiration as an extraordinary aged prince, whereas Laertes lives despised in the country¹⁹; and hence, finally, superannuated fathers relinquished the management of their household affairs, and became dependent upon their sons for support.

There existed no fixed or uniform standard to regulate succession to the throne; it occasionally depended on primogeniture²¹, but we find more

¹⁶ Paus. 7. 2. 1; comp. on Agesilaus, Plut. Ages. 3. Hence the tradition never omits to state when a prince was deformed. See Heracl. Pont. Frag. 5. and 7. In the same manner the German king was obliged to be free from bodily defects, and the ancient priests ἀφελεῖς.

¹⁷ Odys. 11. 495.

¹⁸ Il. 1. 180; comp. Eurip. Androm. 21. 22.

¹⁹ Odys. 1. 190.

²⁰ Θρεπτρα, Il. 4. 477; θρεπτήρια, Hesiod. Op. et Di. 185.

²¹ Paus. 4. 1. 2; Πολυκάων δὲ νεώτερος ἦν ἡλικία καὶ δι' αὐτὸ ιδιώτης. Comp. Herod. 7. 2, concerning the universality of the right of primogeniture.

frequent examples of partition²², or alternate government, as in the case of Eteocles and Polynices, but never of joint government. The crown likewise descended in the female line, as in the case of Helen, but none but children born in wedlock were accounted legitimate, and monogamy alone was customary. Orestes followed Menelaus to Sparta, because the latter had no other children than such as were born of slaves²³. In the acquisition of a lordship by marriage²⁴, or the attainment of the same, as a reward for some great service rendered to the state, through presentation by the ruler of the district²⁵, or, with a species of regeneration of the original principle, through the invitation of a public benefactor to a vacant throne²⁶, it was a tacit condition that none but those of princely birth were eligible, as, for instance, when martial games were appointed for aspirants to the hand of a prince's daughter²⁷.

By reason of their descent and their personal bravery, the princes were revered like beings of a superior order²⁸, and in token of this feeling they received honorary gifts²⁹, especially such as consisted of the spoils of war³⁰, and were offered for their decisions in judicial matters³¹, and these sub-

²² Apollod. 3. 9. 1; 15. 1, etc. Compare on the partition of property, Odys. 14. 208, sqq.

²³ Pausan. 2. 18. 5.

²⁴ e. g. Menelaus, Pelops.

²⁵ Neleus, Melanthus.

²⁶ Œdipus, Atreus. Thucydides, in his democratic mode of viewing things, states that the Argives made Atreus king, τὸ πλῆθος τεθεραπευκότα, p. 1. 9.

²⁷ This is perceptible in the case of the suitors for the hand of Agariste Clisthenes, the Siccydonian's daughter, Herod. 6. 126.

²⁸ Θεὸς δ' ὡς τιετο δῆμῳ, Il. 5. 78; comp. 9. 302. 599, etc.

²⁹ Γέρατα, δωρίναι, ἐῶρα, etc. Od. 7. 150; Il. 9. 155; 1. 230, comprised under the more extensive notion, τιμαί. See Ruhnke, ad Hymn. in Cerer. 328, and the quotation there.

³⁰ Il. 1. 118. 120; 135. 138, etc.

³¹ Hence Hesiod. Op. et Di. 262, δωροφάγοι.

sequently assumed the character of fixed tributes³², whilst the choice morsels in their public feasts were looked upon as their peculiar portion, as of the heroes in general³³. Their qualification as to property consisted in the possession of a demesne³⁴. The yet moderate necessities of the state were provided for according to circumstances. Thus Hector received from the Trojans a contribution for the payment of the allies, as a supply engendered by pressing danger and emergency³⁵.

III. THE POLITICAL AUTHORITIES.

§ 18. The notion of a family implies the conformity of its members to the existing regulations emanating from its head. This dependence became relaxed when a social and gregarious mode of life was the only effectual means of guarding against various kinds of danger; it was seldom dissolved by the exercise of arbitrary authority arising from the consciousness of superior strength, which occurred amongst individuals only. A cavilling demand for standards of law, a watchful jealousy lest the rights of the citizens or those of a class might be infringed by the power of the rulers, as long as their authority was only subjected to the control of moral feeling, and not defined by express legislative enactments, as well as the anxiety displayed in calculating how far the good of the people at

³² This is probably implied by the *ῥητοῖς γέρασι*, Thucyd. 1. 13.

³³ Il. 8. 162; Od. 4. 66; 8. 475; 14. 437. It was the same case with the gods; compare the speech of Zeus, Il. 4. 49, *λοιβῆς τε κνίσσης τε τὸ γὰρ λάχομεν γέρας ἡμεῖς*. On the subject of this custom which was still retained in Sparta, consult Herod. 6. 56; Müller, Dor. 2. 105.

³⁴ *Τέμενος*, Il. 6. 194, sqq.; 9. 574, sqq.; 12. 310, sqq.; Cic. de Repub. p. 129; comp. Kreuser Hellenen Priesterstaat, 140, 141.

³⁵ Il. 17. 225.

large might be consulted by limiting the freedom of individuals, without any violation of the natural rights of the latter, cannot be attributed to a political society existing in a state of nature. The natural feeling, far from developing or asserting the abstract principles of right, led to the elevation and recognition of eminent personal endowments; even the predilection for the monarchical character, which, according to the above, was an essential quality of the supreme political authority¹ amongst the ancient Greeks, is opposed to the assumption of political contracts between prince and people. Examples of formal stipulations, at the election of a prince, do not occur till the decline of the heroic constitution. The oath of the princes, recorded by Aristotle², only refers to the custom which prevailed when a tribunal was held. Such an oath was less an obligation towards the people than a vow to the gods. The prince, the natural head of the body politic, contained within himself the law of his authority; his mode of government was only dependent upon his own will; in its administration he had a purely discretionary power, and it could not, consequently, be looked upon as limited by agreements.

However, the absence of the conventional character by no means prevented the rise of a fixed standard of right in itself: this was looked upon as self-existent, and even when people were unable to counteract that line of conduct in their princes, which deviated from this standard, it still served for a test by which it was tried.

¹ Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἰς κοίρανος ἔστω, Il. 2. 204, rather bears the character of a maxim than of the opinion of an individual.

² Pol. 3. 9. 7.

For on the one side, the princes were, by means of their descent, and even by their authority, brought nearer to the gods, and such a line of demarcation was drawn between them and the people, that it appeared impossible for one of their body ever to become a partaker of similar personal rights with the princes; the earthly right by no means depended on an equality of human pretensions, but on the measure of personal importance, and this, in its turn, on the class to which, in the general order of things, the individual appertained; the legal standard of the lower order could not be applied to the higher; whatever was not interdicted by a higher power, was looked upon as legally allowed, and the right consisted in unrestricted action. The aggregate right then did not appear as a principle developing itself upwards, by virtue of the decrees of an earthly legislature, but as descending from above, and regulated by a class of beings³ legally entitled to occupy a more elevated station, as furnished with more favourable personal endowments. The fountain-head of right, the Olympian Gods, exalted above the test of virtue and moral perfection, in a state of happiness beyond the criterion of human law, distributed to mankind, with despotic humour, good or evil; the rude Cyclops, for the sole reason that they were connected with the divine race, were blessed with profusion of all kinds, but human right availed nothing with them³; and in Hesiod⁴, the second

³ Hence the original signification of *ὑβρις*, a presumptuous aspiring after that which was the exclusive right of a more highly-privileged class. On the other hand, *ἰση*, in Homer's time, already signified that which every one might lay claim to according to his legally-recognised rank. Od. 9. 42. 549; comp. Il. 12. 423.

⁴ Od. 9. 106, sqq.

and third of the three ante-heroic races, in spite of all their depravity, were, in physical condition and bodily stature, assimilated much more closely to the gods, than virtuous men were in a later age.

On the other side, there was a chasm interposed between princes and gods in the descending scale; and although the princes, in earthly affairs, enjoyed unlimited power, and could not be judged by the legal standard of the lower orders, still in the concerns between themselves and the gods, they were equally bound by those ordinances which the latter had been pleased to deliver to the human race as duty and law; and as the lower orders were not entitled to depart from the law, whilst the princes might act in the most arbitrary manner, so it was unlawful for the princes to disturb the unconcern of the blissful race of the gods, as to any possible application to themselves of those decrees they had made to bind mankind, and although, when the latter committed acts of injustice, the enquiry into the right, by virtue of which they had acted, was suppressed by the paramount influence of the princes, and, consequently, could never lead to any definite ordinance for the settlement of princely right; nevertheless, as accustomed as they might be to bear patiently with the unlimited exercise of power in the princes, they were far from being destitute of a clear notion as to their duties⁶, and passed the judgment of outraged feelings on flagrant tyranny⁷; nor did they omit to commend paternal sentiments⁸

⁶ Il. 2. 24; οὐ χρεὶ παννύχιον εὔδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα. On the duty of giving ear to good advice, see 9. 74; 100. 101.

⁷ Δημοβόρος βασιλεύς. Il. 1. 231. On the anger of the princes, see 1. 80. 84; on their capricious favour and displeasure, Od. 4. 692. Hesiod is a downright *Frondeur*, Op. et Di. 39. 100. 259, sqq.

⁸ Od. 2. 234, πατήρ δ' ὥς ἡπιος ἦεν.

and lawful administration⁹ in a prince; on the contrary, public opinion decidedly indicated, that impiety, even when committed in the most exalted of earthly stations, would meet with its reward, and the fate of princes who had bid defiance to the divine laws, was narrated as a fearful example of the vanity of all earthly exaltation. On that account the prophet, the confidant of the divine justice, appeared to announce it to the prince who was ignorant of, or disregarded it, and to admonish him of the punishment impending over him, and thus it was that a divine voice might deprive a prince of the attachment of his people¹⁰. In a higher sphere, the same principles were applied to the gods; they were limited by Zeus, and were compelled to acknowledge him, the emblem of the monarchical principle, as placed above them; whilst Zeus, like themselves, could avail nothing against Fate, that inscrutable power which ruled in darkness, and, exalted above all the grades of personal importance, expressed the idea of the highest and all-pervading law¹¹.

As the prince, according to his legal position, pertained to the divine right, in the same manner he appeared as a mediator to procure its recognition upon earth, and in the notion attached to the most ancient legislations, primary points were, that laws were the revelations of a God, and that they had been communicated to a divine favourite¹². The

⁹ Od. 19. 109, sqq.; comp. Hesiod. Op. et. Di. 200. 223, sqq.

¹⁰ Θεοῦ δμῶν, Od. 3. 215.

¹¹ Homer's wavering definition of the relation between the commands of Fate and the will of Zeus, is based upon earthly political law, wherein the princes enjoyed absolute and unlimited power indeed, but not without the recognition of a higher authority, viz., the rule of right or law in itself. Comp. Heyne, Excurs. ad Il. 6. 458; 17. 331.

¹² On Minos, see Od. 19. 179; compare below, § 40.

law obtained its chief authority and sanction in consequence of being derived from the highest fountain of right in the divine realm¹³, and by being established and administered by a person in the confidence of the gods, a consecrated prince. The notion of such a principle of law as was self-existent, or reposed upon merely political grounds, was still very remote. Whatever emanated from illustrious and wise princes, like Minos¹⁴, attained, by virtue of the princely power, the force of a command¹⁵ for the subjects, and, through custom, assumed the character of established law¹⁶, was precisely fitted to become a pillar of princely authority, and that which had not yet attained the fulness of maturity, was constantly referred to the wisdom of the prince, that his lips might give utterance to the declarations of Zeus. An entire separation between such laws as were independent, and framed in the character of positive enactments, and between the personal decisions or determinations of the prince, notwithstanding the statutes of the divine law possessed the general force and efficacy explained above, was not supposed in reference to the conduct of public concerns, so that the former could be regarded as binding on the prince; however, various prescriptive usages became

¹³ See in reference to this the classical passage in Strab. 16. 761. 762; that which, as divine right, was termed *θέμις*, *θέμιστες*, *θέμιστα*, was named *δίκη* in human jurisprudence, see Moschopul. ad. Hesiod. Op. et Di. 9. The derivation of the word *δίκη* from *Δις*, Zeus, as of *jus* from *Jovis*, is however more ingenious than probable.

¹⁴ See § 41.

¹⁵ This is a leading signification of the word *δίκη*, as Od. 4. 691; 19. 43. 168; 18. 274; 19. 43, etc.

¹⁶ *Εὐνομίη*, Od. 17. 487, the state or condition in which right prevails, implies the early use of *νόμος*, originally the mode of procedure. *Θεσμός* in Od. 23. 296. belongs to *Λέκτροιο πάλαιού*, and the sense fluctuates between right, matrimony, and union; Aristid. Quinctil. de Mus. 2. 82, explains *τὴν ἐν δίκῃ καὶ νόμιμον πράξιν*. it signifies legal ordinance in the Hymn. Mart. 16.

established, and were even partially invested with the force of princely institutes—for instance, those of Minos and Rhadamanthus¹⁷.

This moral check on the princely will was combined with a second, which, strictly speaking, was a political one, but to recur to what has been stated above, one that grew out of circumstances, and was not created by treaty or legislation. The jurisdiction of the prince was not singled out and separated from the general body, nor was its province a remote sphere exalted far above it; for in whatever degree the prince might by virtue of his station be raised above the mass, as the reigning head, he was closely incorporated with the body politic, and ruled like the chief of a family in the midst of his kinsmen; public affairs were transacted amongst them, the prince acted immediately on the people, and performed the duties of his public calling, in this promiscuous intercourse. This check exercised by the individual character of the persons about the sovereign, and like the chorus in the tragedy, which is a transcript of it, a natural consequence of the relation in question, appears as a permanent council in the nobility¹⁸, the elders, and the men in the confidence of Priam¹⁹, the nobles about Alcinous²⁰. The council of war assembled around Agamemnon, composed of the heroes at Troy, was of a different character; this was not convoked for the affairs of the people and the country, but for matters relating to a foreign expedition, and it

¹⁷ See § 41.

¹⁸ Here it is also worthy of remark that the Attic Eupatrids had likewise resided in the citadel. Etym. M. *Εὐπατρ.*

¹⁹ Il. 3. 146, sqq.

²⁰ Od. 7. 98.

cannot be regarded as an evidence of aristocracy. It is as erroneous to suppose that any express ordinance excluded the lower order from a share in public proceedings, as that it conferred such a right upon the nobles; nevertheless the former had by no means assumed the character of a political body; its public attitude was passive; it performed its political functions in quiet and obedience; and the expression of its acquiescence was conveyed by acclamations, not by voting²¹; the presumption of an individual met with a reception similar to that of Thersites²². Homer is decidedly opposed to the mode of proceeding adopted by the plebeian; the whole narrative²³ expresses disapprobation. But the mere presence of the people during public deliberation and decrees, must necessarily have acted as a check on arbitrary proceedings. This joint deliberation, in which the prince was surrounded by the nobles, and both by the people, appears to have been the natural characteristic of the heroic state, and from the reciprocity of its action to have been the security for its existence. Now in the same manner as it was decided by the nature of the order, whether the share of that order in public concerns should be an active or a passive one, it depended upon circumstances whether the princes engaged in the conduct of some affair of state should be attended by a part of the people only, or by the whole body. The narrow extent of the heroic dominions, how-

²¹ Il. 12. 213. He who belongs to the *demus* is not allowed to speak. Comp. 2. 202, where such a person is said to be οὐτε ποτ' ἐν πολέμῳ ἐναρίθμιος οὐτ' ἐνὶ βουλῇ.

²² Δημαγωγὸν τινος, Dion. Chrys. 1. 80.

²³ Il. 2. 211, sqq.

ever, and that desire to participate in public affairs²⁴, which was rooted in the nature of the Grecian race, afford strong presumption, that as often as the public service required it, the people were willing to assemble in sufficient numbers. Still there is equal probability in the conjecture, that circumstances might ordain a previous consultation between the prince and the nobles²⁵, whilst the people were afterwards convened to hear the resolution. The relation of the aristocratic council to the general assembly was not yet accurately defined; circumstances, likewise, in this respect, decided whether their agency should be joint or separate, and the marked line of distinction afterwards drawn between assemblies of the council and those of the people did not yet exist²⁶. There is no vestige of an obligation in the prince to convocate either assembly within a given time: an assembly might however be convened by a member of the council of nobles²⁷, or it might be held without the presence of the prince²⁸; but the notion of a representation of the supreme power was not yet developed; during the absence of Ulysses the people were not once convoked²⁹. The maxim of a formal opposition between prince and assembly, and a question as to the legitimate position of the latter with regard to the former, were equally unknown. The first instance that is recorded of the responsibility of the political func-

²⁴ Comp. Herod. 1. 153.

²⁵ Il. 2. 53. 86; 10. 195; 6. 113, γέροντες βουλευταί.

²⁶ Ἀγοραὶ βουλευφόροι, Od. 9. 112. Ἀγορά of the nobles, Il. 8. 489; 9. 11. 33.

²⁷ This, it must be confessed, only happened in the camp at Troy, Il. 1. 54; 19. 40, sqq.

²⁸ This appears to be the case, Il. 18. 497.

²⁹ Od. 2. 15.

tionaries (εὐθύνη), which afterwards so generally obtained, is probably when the Athenian nobility limited the power of the Codrid Medon; but this is, at the same time, a termination of the heroic monarchical system³⁰, which was only liable to censure or commendation through the medium of public opinion; thus Polydamas, in Troy, appears as the candid judge of Hector's conduct, and the latter is fearful of his reprehension³¹; in the Odyssey frequent allusion is made to the animadversions of the people³². An application for legal redress against the prince at the bar of the assembly, could therefore scarcely have been attended with success when heroes like Peleus, Hercules, or Orestes, fled their country on account of a murder. This seldom happened, it is true, without a design to evade the penalty of retribution; but the chief impression by which they were actuated was, that divine punishment would surely overtake that man who should omit to effect his purification, and expiate his crime by flight. But after the traditional account had been adorned with numerous democratic accessions, there was every disposition to add the fiction of a public vindication of justice, which was partly done to enhance the authority of an actual tribunal; thus Orestes, and even the god Mars, were said to have been arraigned at the bar of the Areopagus, and other heroes before various Attic courts³³. Lastly, tumults of the populace are totally unconnected with the question of public law; proceedings of

³⁰ Paus. 4. 5. 4.

³¹ Il. 13. 735; 22. 100.

³² Χαλεπή δῆμον φῆμις, 14. 239; comp. 19. 527; 16. 95. 114.

³³ Paus. 1. 28. 10, sqq.; comp. Tittmann, *griech. Staatsv.* 66, sqq.

this character resulted from the contention of the princes in the last military council before the walls of Troy³⁴; insurrection is implied by occasional allusions to the punishment of stoning³⁵; but from other passages it may be inferred, that executions were likewise employed by the princes³⁶.

Finally, through the whole *Odyssey* we behold marked indications of a struggle of the nobles against the power of the prince. The *Odyssey* does not express that profound reverence for the princely dignity, which is so uniformly the characteristic of the *Iliad*, and we especially miss the respect for the transmission of the same by hereditary succession in the family of the reigning sovereign³⁷; Telemachus says, that the princely power may be transferred from the house of Ulysses to one of the other chiefs, and he thenceforward be lord of a family. Amongst the Phæacians there are thirteen princely lines³⁸. However, the fundamental idea of the *Odyssey* is clearly a picture of the attempted, but vindicated usurpation on the part of the nobility of the rights and privileges of that prince, who, it is true, experienced the severest trials, but was still an object so cherished by the gods as to be singled out for the love of Circe and Calypso. The revenge of Ulysses throws the proper light on all that had preceded, and even on

³⁴ *Od.* 3. 130, sqq. On the other hand compare on the despotic power of the princes in war, § 19. n. 24.

³⁵ *Il.* 3. 57; *Eurip. Orest.* 59. 436; *Plut. Qu. Gr.* 7. 178. For examples from the historical age, consult *Paus.* 3. 5. 8; comp. *Thuc.* 5. 60; *Schol. Aristoph. Acharn.* 447.

³⁶ As that of Palamedes, *Schol. Eurip. Orest.* 432; comp. the commentary on *Soph. Antig.* 762.

³⁷ *Od.* 1. 394.

³⁸ *Od.* 8. 390. Comp. 7. 49.

the sentiment uttered by Telemachus during his degradation. As from this it might be proved that the subjoined narrative recording the warlike preparations of the Ithacans against Ulysses is spurious, an important light is thrown upon the question touching the unity of the Odyssey. It may at least be safely asserted that in the Odyssey are shadowed the incipient efforts of the nobility against the declining monarchy.

IV. THE EXTERNAL RELATIONS AMONGST -THE STATES.

§ 19. The answer to the question, what unions were recognised as states by the Greeks of the heroic age amongst themselves, is contained in the preceding: the distinctive feature of an heroic state was the government of a prince, and every community over which a prince presided was considered as a state, as far as the views entertained in those early stages of civil polity admitted a definite notion of its nature. But the unity which the state possessed in the princely head was by no means an instrument to connect its individual parts into one body, in such a manner that one member should in every respect share the responsibilities of the other. Thus it constantly happened that the liberty and security of individuals were endangered by the depredations of hordes that roamed about by land and sea¹, at the same time that the states to which they respectively belonged, took no steps to repulse the danger as one directed against themselves. On the other

¹ Thucyd. 1. 5.: — οὐκ ἔχοντός ποω αἰσχύνην τούτου τοῦ ἔργου, φέροντος δέ τι καὶ δόξης μᾶλλον. Comp. on the point, Arist. Pol. 5. 2. 3.

side, as has been already remarked, legal protection was secured to strangers, and guaranteed upon the common faith, even when the latter were not strictly under the protection of treaties of hospitality or of any other kind, but herein too the political notion was lost sight of, and the individual alone was regarded. It is impossible to determine whether those cases in which the whole state was considered to be concerned, are to be limited to such as regarded the prince personally; it is however certain that the danger of an individual was sometimes considered the affair of the whole community; but princes occasionally separated themselves voluntarily from the general body, when they went out on adventures with their heroic compeers, as was the case with the Argonauts; princely treaties of hospitality can only in a limited number of instances be looked upon as the infancy of the subsequent political hospitality; however, in general the state-system was not yet sufficiently matured, accurately to distinguish between the affair of the prince as such, and in his capacity of representative of the nation.

But the recognition of the collective body is more decidedly pronounced in the proceedings adopted in any danger that was considered general²; these were not only in the nature of an irruption into the hostile territory, with a demand of reparation³, but also of an amicable application to the people at large for satisfaction⁴, in which the mediation of a neutral state was without doubt

² A remarkable instance occurs, Od. 21. 17. πᾶς δῆμος ὄφελλε.

³ 'Ρύσι' ἐλαύνεσθαι, Il. 11. 673.

⁴ Il. 5. 804; 10. 286; 11. 140; Δοῦναι καὶ δεῖχεσθαι δίκην, Hymn. Mercur. 312.

sometimes employed. A leading test of mutual recognition as states, is the sanctity of heralds or ambassadors⁵. Moreover the state was virtually represented, when a dispute was decided by single combat upon the public guarantee⁶. In real warfare the object of an expedition was not unfrequently looked upon as accomplished upon the acquisition of spoil, the receipt of a ransom for the captives⁷, and occasionally of a tribute by way of indemnity⁸; however the struggle was sometimes directed against the very existence of the hostile state; a people was expelled as in the wars amongst the Thessalian tribes, towns and villages were destroyed, the population put to death, or reduced to bondage⁹, the gods carried away¹⁰, and the ground declared accursed¹¹.

That political impulse in the members of every single community arising from the natural separation amongst the Grecian provinces, to defend their freedom and independence against their neighbours, was accompanied by the no less innate tendency to friendly association, and the early developed ambition to make other states dependent upon themselves. Amongst the chief fruits of the first were the sacrificial and festal communions¹². Religion had at a very early period been combined with the ties of blood; amongst the members of a tribe the sacrificial and festal communion propa-

⁵ Il. 1. 334; 7. 274; 11. 344. In the *Mythus* indeed, Hercules violated this right in the same manner as he did those of hospitality. See Apollod. 2. 4. 11; Paus. 9. 25. 4.

⁶ Il. 3. 276, sqq. Comp. my *Jus gentium*, etc. p. 47. n. 8.

⁷ Ἀποίνα, Il. 6. 46; 11. 131. Ζωάγρια is merely a reward given by a person whose life has been spared without actual reference to a ransom.

⁸ Τιμή, Il. 3. 288.

⁹ Il. 9. 589; 22. 64.

¹⁰ Paus. 6. 48. 2.

¹¹ Strab. 13. 601.

¹² Πανηγύρεις.

gated itself by the multiplication of those unions sprung from the same tribe, like a gradually-extending fire from the parent hearth, and was an emblem of the fervour which characterised the original relationship. Ties of this nature were likewise contracted between such as were not descended from a common stock¹³, and peace and friendship preserved for the purposes of general intercourse, particularly during the festivals¹⁴. However, notwithstanding some of these primeval unions, such as that of ONCHESTUS¹⁵, CALAURIA¹⁶, and the *Panegyris* on the isthmus¹⁷, maintained their ground till the historical times, those ties were seldom of such a nature as to generate a comprehensive political union, or a confederacy of states pledged to a reciprocity of representation. The military alliances belonged in part to the heroic expedition in quest of adventures already described. The spirit of conquest, by which one state endeavoured to make others dependent upon itself, seems to have asserted itself at a very early period; thus Crete under Minos encroached upon the territories of its neighbours¹⁸, and Thebes was compelled to pay tribute to Erginus of Orchomenus¹⁹.

None of the ancient festal associations, and no league of any other description, united the whole of the Greeks before the expedition against Troy,

¹³ Ἀμφικτιόνες, περικτιόνες generally, both probably originally the dwellers around a common sanctuary. (Strab. 14. 650, οἱ κύκλῳ πάντες). See the latter word, II. 17. 220; 18. 212; 19. 104. 109.

¹⁴ Strab. 9. 419.: καὶ γὰρ κατὰ πόλεις συνήεσαν καὶ κατὰ ἔθνος φυσικῶς κοινωνικοὶ ὄντες· καὶ ἅμα τῆς παρ' ἀλλήλων χρείας χάριν καὶ εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ κοινὰ ἀπήντων διὰ τὰς αὐτὰς αἰτίας, ἑορτὰς καὶ πανηγύρεις συντελοῦντες.

¹⁵ II. 2. 506. Hymn. Apoll. 230; Strab. 9. 284; Müller, Orchom. 271.

¹⁶ See § 24.

¹⁷ Müller, Dor. 1. 238.

¹⁸ Thucyd. 1. 48; Aristot. Pol. 2. 7. 2; Diodor. 4. 63.

¹⁹ Apollod. 2. 3. 11; Paus. 9. 37. 2.

and certainly not the pretended diffusion of the princely family from Hellen's line. In the uniformity of the heroic government and manners thereby implied, the predominance of martial courage and strength, lay a principle which was eminently calculated to disunite. It cannot, indeed, be a matter of doubt, whether the Greeks of the heroic age could so far raise themselves above that which separated them politically as to regard themselves in the light of a single nation; Homer's appellations, Argives, Danaans, Achæans, in themselves, indeed, designate but individual parts of one, but are employed in reference to the whole body²⁰; Homer likewise gives them a common language, the same gods, and a similar government and character. But political unity by no means follows; uniformity of language never prevented national races from being politically strange, and even hostile to each other. The supreme deity Zeus was an object of adoration to every single tribe of the nation, as such, but was not on that account a principle which established peace and concord amongst the partakers of a common worship; every union appropriated him directly and immediately to itself, and not through the medium of the nation, in conjunction with which it only addressed itself to him in particular cases. Thus, united agency was only occasioned by particular circumstances, such as the expedition against Troy. The tradition that Helen's suitors had bound themselves by an oath to Tindarus as the future security of their marriage, to pursue in common every

²⁰ Strab. 8. 340; ποιητικῷ δέ τινι σχήματι συγκαταλέγειν τὸ μέρος τῶ ὅλῳ φασὶ τὸν Ὅμηρον.

danger which should menace her²¹, converts the expedition into a chivalric enterprise: but it seems more probable that the *hegemony* of the Atridæ²², was the means to assemble the whole nation upon their warlike summons²³. Agamemnon, as commander-in-chief²⁴, appears to have exercised the same right over the allies, as the prince in the field asserted over the nobility of his own country²⁵. However, the absence of all the warriors from Greece, in the poem, is apparently without any influence on its political relations.

A political distinction between the Greeks collectively and foreign nations as a body was yet but vaguely apprehended. In general there was no opposition based upon that which the Greeks recognised as their common property²⁶; the Trojans, it must be confessed, descended from a common stock with themselves, appear in the character of enemies to them only from an accidental cause, and not on account of a difference of nationality; the Greeks recognised his own gods every where, heroic institutions were ascribed to the states without the limits of Greece, and, perhaps, with the exception of the Læstrygonians, the Sintians, and a few inhospitable princes like Echetus, Busiris²⁷,

²¹ Stesichor. ap. Schol. Hom. Il. 2. 239; Thuc. 1. 9; comp. Sophoc. Ajax. 1102, and Schol. 1132; Apollod. 3. 10. 9; Paus. 2. 22. 3; 3. 20. 9; Hygin. 78.

²² Thuc. 1. 9; compare Il. 1. 281; ἄλλ' ὅγε φέρτερός ἐστιν, ἐπεὶ πλεόνεσσιν ἀνάσσει, and Il. 9. 69.

²³ This is connected with the Ζεὺς ὀμαγύριος, Paus. 7. 24; 1. 2.

²⁴ Ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν.

²⁵ Concerning the remarkable πᾶρ γὰρ ἐμοὶ θάνατος. See Schneid. ad. Aristot. Pol. 3. 9. 2.

²⁶ Comp. Thucyd. 1. 3, whose opinion that there had been originally a great resemblance between Greeks and barbarians must not be overlooked.

²⁷ Od. 18. 84; Apollod. 1. 9. 20; 2. 5. 11. Their violation of the laws of hospitality is tacitly declared unhellenic; Strab. 17. 802, calls the ξενηλασία peculiar to the barbarians.

etc., the remaining population of the earth was collected within an heroic circle; nay, even fabulous nations, the Abii or Macrobiani, Hippomolgi, Ethiopians, and Hyperboreans²⁸, raised above the Greeks themselves. The difference in language was indeed observed²⁹, but not in such a manner that the idea of the barbarian quality was definitely expressed. Finally, there was no word to designate the barbarian nations or regions collectively³⁰.

THE EXTERNAL RELATIONS AMONGST THE STATES FROM THE DORIC MIGRATION TILL THE BEGINNING OF THE PERSIAN WARS.

1. WHAT DIVIDED THE GRECIAN STATES.

a. Political Character of the Migrations.

§ 20. From the poetical colouring which is diffused over the state-system of the heroic age, it would be fruitless to attempt individually to trace the inner germs of its dissolution. According to the general law of change in human, as well as in political life, when once the maturity of its vigour was past, it was incapable of withstanding any violent shock from without. The first impulse to a departure from the ancient course proceeded from the disastrous lot of the heroes at Troy, or on their

²⁸ See in general Mannert, 4. 85, sqq. new edit.

²⁹ Σίντιας ἀγριοφώνους, Od. 8. 294; Καρῶν βαρβαροβόωνων, Il. 2. 867; ἀλλόθροος, Od. 1. 183; 3. 302; 4. 43; Ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη, 19. 175.

³⁰ Thuc. 1. 3; Strab. 8. 369, 370.

return¹; the next from the migration of the Thes-salians and Bœotians; and its final consummation was brought about by the migration of the Heraclid princes with the Dorians, which was entitled heroic only upon the ground of supposed hereditary claims². The new and all-prevailing element now supplanted ancient manners and customs—existing forms were dissolved—a spirit of sedition diffused through the Grecian provinces—the oldest and most intimate ties were severed—the princely authority extirpated from its original seat, the hereditary citadel, by means of settlements and emigrations—the consciousness of unrestricted political agency aroused in the multitude—attempts made to regulate the new political masses in their relations to each other, and in those amongst their members respectively—and a spirit of activity called into operation in various directions, which unceasingly agitated, and unable to arrive at stability, at length consumed itself.

This was exhibited in the unceasing and feverish desire of emigration which lasted for several centuries³. The feeling excited by the Thessalian irruption must, in the nature of things, have suggested to them that the condition of the governing was preferable to that of the governed; the view of those who had obtained the ascendancy, acted

¹ Hesiod. *Op. et Di.* 161, sqq.; Plato de Legg. 3. 682. D. E., where, however, Achæans and Dorians are strangely confounded together.

² Müller, *Dor.* 1. 49. 50, considers Hercules to have been a god of purely Doric origin, and looks upon the tradition of his derivation from Argos as the fiction of a later age emanating from the Doric Argos. Comp. his *Prolegom.* 427. However, even those who do not assent to this view of the subject can only suppose that the hereditary claim in question was pretended.

³ See an enumeration of the causes in Sainte-Croix, sur l'état, etc.; Heyne. *Opusc.* 1. 290, sqq.; Raoul-Rochette, *Hist. de l'établiss.* etc. c. 3; Mannert, *Italien*, 2. 205, etc. The subject is compendiously treated in Seneca ad Helvid. 6.

upon the consciousness of fearlessness and strength in such as had themselves once governed and were now obliged to obey, or had been deprived of their hereditary rulers; their native home, now a prey to the foreign invaders, lost its most endearing associations; they became strangers as it were in the land of their fathers; and perhaps influenced by the wonders that poetry ascribed to other regions, cherished the hope of finding a new political home upon some foreign shore, where, if they could not govern others, they might at least assert their own independence; perils and hardships were willingly encountered to secure exemption from the oppression of the victor, and they migrated the more easily as there existed no force to compel them to wear chains at home. But neither could the conquerors habituate themselves to tranquillity and order, straitened as they were for space in the midst of a youthful and prolific population; as a necessary consequence of this disproportion, a deficiency in the conveniences and necessities of life was soon experienced, and their struggles to enlarge the bounds within which their civil rights and privileges were confined in their over-peopled and now joyless country, operated in a series of voluntary emigrations⁴ and expeditions for drafting off the surplus population⁵, not to mention colonial cities founded for the systematic extension of the state. This constant effort to escape from a state

⁴ As at a late date Dorieus from Sparta, Herod. 5. 42.

⁵ e. g. The Minyans and Parthenians from Laconia. A peculiar custom, similar to the old Italian "ver sacrum," was the sending forth consecrated bands, ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχαί, such as the migrations of the Magnesians, the Ænians, the Chalcidians (to Rhegium), etc. See Müller, Dor. 1. 257. 258. 260. 265.

of things that was irksome, was closely allied to the love of enterprise so deeply rooted in the buoyant and enterprising soul of the Greeks, but which did not, like the chivalric spirit of adventure, evaporate in restless and aimless wandering, but was invariably accompanied by the desire to form a political union. The Greeks bore with them as it were a political seed; those who went forth were not lost to the mother country, as in the eventual decline of the states of Greece when Grecian mercenaries wandered over Asia like homeless outcasts, but they almost universally made the institutions of their own country spring up, as it were, from new roots on foreign ground, and under different physical circumstances; this was continued by the colonies which were, with few exceptions, established on the sea-coast or on islands. The possessions obtained by conquest or treaty extended but little beyond the municipal pale of the respective cities; their political position with regard to their inland neighbours was for the most part without any firm guarantee, and an extension of their territory in that direction would have been precarious. Hence, upon the extraordinary increase in the population, the local advantages of the coasts furnished a clue to the course of colonisation; it will at once be perceived that it was in vain to attempt preserving a continuity of territory, and more advisable to possess themselves of a distant but commodious situation, than, through fear of placing themselves beyond the reach of a Grecian city, or one of Grecian origin, to fix on some unfavourable spot in its vicinity. It must be confessed that it was the more natural that politi-

cal separation should arise amongst states thus isolated by nature.

b. The Grecian Communities in a state of separation.

§ 21. Through the migrations, and that desire of independence which produced and attended, or was itself a consequence of them, the original fraternal relation between the tribes necessarily became dissolved; whilst the more recent tie that connected mother and daughter states grew exceedingly relaxed.

The former, from its nature, even in the provinces of the mother country little calculated to maintain permanent political unity, was shaken to its centre in the migrations themselves, by the mixed character of the multitude that accompanied the expedition of the Dorians to Peloponnesus¹, the voyage of the Ionians² and Æolians³ towards Asia, and at a later period by the heterogeneous ingredients which were added to them in their new habitations. It must be particularly borne in mind that the spirit of alliance amongst the members of a tribe was most effectually promoted by dwelling together in the rural districts, but that it was weakened by a residence in cities. Hence there arose amongst the Greeks within, as well as without the mother country, the most unbounded desire of separation. As in civil and social life generally the unlimited freedom of individuals is opposed to the well-being of the whole, inasmuch as it tends to loosen the junctures of the political fabric, so the Grecian provinces were disunited by the

¹ Paus. 5. 4. 1; comp. Manso, Sparta. 1. 53. n.; Raoul-Roch. 3. 5.

² Herod. 1. 146.

³ Müller, Orchom. 398.

endeavours of every, and even the smallest association to assume a separate and independent character. The notions of state and territory again became narrowed, and that feeling which did not scruple to sacrifice the independence of a smaller body to the object of forming a larger and more comprehensive confederacy, ceased to exist; every community that was able to subsist individually, disregarded all obligations which involved the necessity of dependence. The endeavour to attain this object at the commencement of this period produced those numerous cities of which few had existed in the heroic age⁴, and some of which were erected below the Acropolis of the ancient princes as lower towns, and others built from their foundations together with a citadel⁵. The city with its jurisdiction henceforward became the mark of unity and independence; a *state* was a community surrounded and held together by walls, and *city* and *state* became equivalent terms⁶. Accordingly those cities, which the local features of a district had naturally marked out for political union, endeavoured to render themselves distinct and independent communities; such as were

⁴ Doubtless Thebes and Athens were of the number. See Hom. Od. 11. 263; comp. Paus. 9. 5. 1. 3. on Thebes; concerning Athens, see Thucyd. 2. 15; comp. § 43. On the vanity of the Athenians, who pretended to have been the first to erect cities, see Steph. Byz. ἄστυ. Was Calydon a town in the heroic age? Il. 9. 526, sqq. And Lebadea? Paus. 9. 39. 1. I should rather regard the Homeric description of Calydon as the product of the poet's mind. The Homeric poems clearly evince the prevalence of the feeling in favour of new towns, e. g. the town of the Phæacians, Od. 6. 9.

⁵ Strab. 8. 336. 337. 386; Herod. 1. 142. 149; Paus. 7. 18. 3; comp. n. and § 32; as well as Append. viii.

⁶ See Append. viii. where κοινόν is likewise explained. A remarkable instance of the recognition of the principle that the city constituted the state, is narrated of a later age by Xenoph. Hell. 3. 2. 31; the Spartans would not deprive the vanquished Eleans of the presidency at the Olympic games, because τοὺς ἀντιποιοιμένους (viz. the Pisatans, who at that time had no town,) χωρίτας εἶναι καὶ οὐχ ἰκάνους προεστάναι.

younger and more inconsiderable withdrawing from those which were older and more powerful⁷.

The bond amongst the members of the same race or tribe was most endangered in those provinces where rural life was earliest modified by the erection of towns; but even where this did not happen, that bond at least failed to exhibit any politically uniting efficacy. Let us direct our attention to ARCADIA. The Arcadians, whose principal towns were not built till a later period⁸, present the spectacle of races which if not hostile to each other, were at least disunited; the Lycæan games⁹ were scarcely upon a single occasion a Panegyris attended by all the Arcadians; the states of MANTINEA and TEGEA¹⁰, and a third, of less importance, that of Orchomenus, afterwards maintained themselves beside each other with an equal balance of power. The rest of Arcadia, part of which had at one time been dependent on the prince of Orchomenus¹¹, subsequently consisted of several confederacies¹², of which some were independent, and others subject to Mantinea. In a still less degree, therefore, was the bond among the tribes of the Peloponesian Dorians¹³ of a nature to conduce to political association; it neither perverted

⁷ To this must be referred Thuc. 4. 102. *πρὸς τε γὰρ τοὺς ἀστυγέιτους πᾶσι τὸ ἀντίπαλον καὶ ἐλεύθερον καθίσταται.*

⁸ Tegea, composed of nine townships, Paus. 8. 45. 1, afterwards Mantinea, of five. See the Comment. on. Xenoph. Hell. 5. 2. 7.

⁹ Pind. Ol. 7. 153; Paus. 8. 2. 1; 38. 4; Dion. Hal. 1. 25; Marm. Oxon. ep. 18.

¹⁰ The *Ἑστία Ἀρκάδων κοινὴ* at Tegea (Paus. 8. 53. 3.) never effected political unity.

¹¹ Heracl. Pont. ap. Diog. L. 1. 94. Trapezus belonged to it, and was for some time a royal residence; Paus. 8. 5. 3; 4. 17. 2. Strab. 8. 362. makes Aristocrates of Orchomenus chief of the Arcadian confederate army. But that Tegea must not be included is evident from Aristot. ap. Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 172.

¹² Comp. Kortüm, hellen. Verfass. 158, sqq.; Müller, Dor. 2. 450—452.

¹³ See Append. ix.

the early wars between Sparta and Argos, nor the subjugation of Messenia. Lastly, the real character of the coalition between the members of Doric and Ionic tribes in the Peloponessian war has already¹⁴ been explained. It is natural to suppose that the alliance between mother states and colonies, would have displayed more binding efficacy than that amongst the descendants of a common tribe, the root of whose relationship was lost in the remoteness of antiquity, as the origin of the former could be accurately traced, and from the twofold claims of the mother city, to a community of origin and the character of a political home, the affinity was less liable to be forgotten. But if we attentively consider the operation of purely natural ties, we shall find that the obligations of filial duty were not acknowledged by those cities whose founders were singled out from the mother city during the agitation caused by the migrations, or had been expelled from it¹⁵, or by colonial towns founded for a political object, and held in strict dependence by force. Finally, to revert to the pretensions of Thebes, the same holds good of those towns of a district which had originally stood on a sisterly footing with its capital, but over which the latter afterwards arrogated to itself maternal authority. Thus limited, the integrity of the tie of consanguinity could only be preserved amongst those children of the state who went forth in peace, and with the customary ceremonies of conventional separation.

¹⁴ See § 14.

¹⁵ Serv. ad Virgil. *Æn.* 1. 12: hæ autem coloniæ sunt, quæ ex consilio publico, non ex secessione conditæ sunt.

This mode of departure may be compared to that of a son who, arrived at manhood, quits his father's house in search of independence, and whose subsequent condition must not be judged by the standard of paternal authority among the Romans, but by that of the natural and spontaneous attachment to the family from which he is sprung. The regard of the colonies for the mother cities was, it must be owned, kept up by various observances; the emigrants carried with them the sacred fire of political life from the native *prytaneum*¹⁶, as well as their hereditary gods¹⁷; moreover, they generally obtained priests from the parent city¹⁸, to which they sent *Theorias*, *Choruses*, ect.¹⁹, to participate in the celebration of a festival; they also paid it testimonies of respect upon the occasion of festive assemblies on a larger scale; leaders were selected from it for the founding of new colonies²¹, various customs and regulations were retained²², and even local associations kept up by corresponding denominations in the new home²³. Now if these services, which have so frequently been enumerated both in ancient and modern times²⁴, remained neverthe-

¹⁶ Herod. 1. 146; Thuc. 1. 26.

¹⁷ e. g. Strab. 5. 179; Paus. 3. 23. 4; comp. Müller, Dor. 1. 225.

¹⁸ Thucyd. 1. 25.

¹⁹ Paus. 5. 21. 1; comp. Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 385. on the subject of the *oxen* which the colonies of Athens sent to the *Panathenæa*, and the *Ionian primita* sent to Athens, Isocrat. Paneg. § 7. On the obligations of the *Magnetes* on the *Mæander* to the Delphic oracle, which, though similar, rested on essentially different grounds, see Aristoph. ap. Ath. 4. 173. E.

²⁰ Thuc. 1. 25; 6. 3... ²¹ Strab. 6. 264.

²² *Νόμιμα*, Thuc. 6. 4.

²³ Thus there was a *Crathis* in *Achaia*, and another near *Sybaris*. On the *Megarian* names of places in the vicinity of *Byzantium*, see Müller, Dor. 1. 121.

²⁴ The contest between *America* and the mother country called forth numerous and partial writings on the subject of colonies. Heyne, Opusc. 1. 290, sqq. lays too much stress on the arrogant language of the *Corinthians*. Sainte-

less for the most part unperformed²⁵, what has been observed of the relation amongst the members of a tribe, must be repeated in reference to the estrangement of the colonies, namely, that from the mixture of the original colonists, whether it arose at the commencement of the migration or through after-comers²⁶, it is unnecessary to enquire, the feeling of affinity could not be exclusively directed to one parent²⁷ whilst the system of separation in the other towns had equal force in the colonies. Add to this the boldness and love of independence so conspicuous in the Greeks, and their peculiar faculty, on quitting the political home of their fathers to transplant their native manners and customs, so that every fresh community struck root like a scion from the parent stem, and flourished as a new tree. Besides this, a further estrangement between the original mother and a colony could not fail to arise, when the latter founded fresh colonies. This was moreover augmented by the general remoteness of the kindred towns from one another, the benefits flowing from the physical character of the new settlements—those who at home had struggled with privation and penury obtaining extensive and commodious habitations—and the circumstance that scarcely a single colony was deficient in those productions of nature which were essential to its physical well-

Croix, in his pamphlet in favour of America, advocates the severing the colonial ties to the utmost possible extent.

²⁵ Thuc. 1. 38; comp. Dion. Hal. 3. 7: ὅσης γὰρ ἀξιοῦσι τιμῆς τυγχάνειν οἱ πατέρες παρὰ τῶν ἐγγόνων, τοσαύτης οἱ κτίσαντες τὰς πόλεις παρὰ τῶν ἀποίκων, and Polyb. 12. 10.—ὥς γονεῦσι πρὸς τέκνα.

²⁶ See Raoul-Roch. on the subject of Heraclea Pontica, Amisus, Rhegium, Locri, Croton, Sybaris, Messana, Leontini, etc.

²⁷ "Ἐποικοί. Compare below § 33. n. 17.

being, and, consequently, was not induced to look back to the home it had left with fondness and regret, whilst a great number of them attained prosperity, riches, and power, earlier and more easily than their respective mother towns. In the same manner new customs were engrafted on the new settlement with every fresh generation; its attachment to the past diminished, and with every nearer approach to the manners of its neighbours, the remembrance of the land of its ancestors grew fainter.

It even frequently happened that the luxurious descendants looked upon the inmates of the old paternal house, who had remained far behind them in the march of social improvement, with that complacent pity which deigns to cast a faint reflection from its own greatness on the home of its fathers. The highest point at which this feeling arrived, is beheld in the attempt of Sybaris to institute within its own territory national games in lieu of the Olympic²⁸. Thus such colonies as were able to assert their independence, maintained in fact but a slight political connection with the mother-states; Miletus sent to Paros, not to Athens²⁹ for arbitrators in the Persian war; Crotona³⁰ was the only town belonging to the Italiots that assisted the mother country, and what is still more remarkable, at a time when its progenitors the Achæans remained inactive; but Corcyra³¹ and Megara³² became refractory, and acted with violence to

²⁸ Heracl. Pont. ap. Ath. 12. 522. A.

²⁹ Herod. 5. 28, sqq.

³⁰ Herod. 8. 47.

³¹ Thucyd. 1. 13; Herod. 3. 49, sqq.

³² Paus. 6. 20. 9. Compare on the proverb *Ζεὺς Κορίνθιος*, Schol. Pind. Nem. 7. 155; Schol. Plat. Euthyd. 96; Ruḡḡk. Zenob. 3. 21.

the mother-town, as did Corinth and Ægina to Epidaurus³³. But the most complete picture of division in general, without any connecting link whatever, is presented by a great number of second-rate Dorian and Æolian colonies in Asia, the settlements of Miletus on the Pontus, and the towns of the Thracian coast. The prospect of danger occasionally led to a renovation of those ties which were either relaxed or entirely dissolved; thus the Achæan Italiots, after the dismemberment of the Pythagorean league, applied to the mother country Achaia³⁴, whilst on the other hand the parent cities never failed to assert the principle of natural alliance, when they wished to establish claims upon it, or to give a colour of justice to their proceedings; thus Pisistratus reduced Naxos to subjection by virtue of the metropolitan rights of Athens³⁵.

II. WHAT UNITED THE GRECIAN STATES.

a. Festal Communion, (πανηγύρεις.)

§ 22. The desire of intercourse, a feeling which sooner or later awakes in the wildest minds¹, no less than intelligent and systematic policy, directed to the establishment and maintenance of friendly relations with other states, pervaded the whole body of the Greek nation—divided as it was in certain directions by the spirit of separation—with the numerous subtle and delicate ties of social culture and refinement, which associated the severed mem-

³³ Herod. 5. 84.

³⁴ Polyb. 2. 39.

³⁵ Herod. 1. 64; Thucyd. 3. 104.

¹ Sainte-Croix judiciously observes: le besoin rapproche les hommes, le plaisir les rassemble, la crainte les unit.

bers, still existing in endless diversities of combination, into smaller or larger wholes, and even into a well-constituted general union.

The operation of the tendency to festive meetings in the panegyres and Amphictyonies of the heroic time, is beheld in the succeeding age in the full maturity of its vigour. The Greeks in general possessed that fertile talent, which may with truth be called an endowment from heaven, to enliven existence with the song and the dance, and as this rendered the Grecian *symposia* so brilliant and intellectual, it was owing to the same cause that their popular festivals on a more extended scale presented so many features of attraction. To this must be added their innate admiration of the beautiful, and a disposition to recognise its peculiar and pre-eminent manifestation in whatever belonged to the Greek nation. These two features are united in their worship; the religious feeling was displayed in cheerful² and attractive spectacles, and this in its turn led to the formation of festal circles for the purposes of enjoyment and show. Hence numerous festive meetings, both such as had already existed in the heroic, and still continued in the subsequent ages, but more or less modified by the migrations, and such as were newly-instituted, attained their object in their celebration, viz. the enjoyment of festal pleasure; this was the chief end of their institution³, whilst the suspension of hostilities was not so much the result of a particular policy, as a natural incident to the festival, and understood of course, that it might not be

² Strab. 10. 467.

³ Ἐκείνη.

contaminated by impiety; and for the same reason those who were polluted by the crime of murder, were forbidden to take part in it⁴. Hereto at a very early period were annexed various kinds of public intercourse, such as intermarriage, community of citizenship, etc., whereby it was afterwards designed to contract and to maintain political ties⁵. But it is not consistent with the infancy of political intercourse, as described by Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁶, to suppose, as the preconceived intention and object of their formation, political union in the higher and more comprehensive sense of the term, which several festal associations of a later date, distinctly and deliberately recognised as the end and scope of their coalition. On the other hand, it will be perceived, that the intentionally more binding and purely political links that connected several later associations were broken by the selfish desire of enjoyment, and that they were held together by the frail bands of pleasure alone, without regard to austerer political considerations. Thus many celebrated panegyres are not to be viewed in the light of assemblies of the wise men of the nation, but should rather be compared to a meeting of jovial boon-companions, whose real object in coming together, was to partake of the good cheer set before them. This was the more detrimental to truly political objects as the pane-

⁴ Demosth. c. Aristocr. 632; Antiph. de Choreut. 761.

⁵ Comp. § 18. n. 13. and Etym. M. ἀγορά and Bekker. Anecd. 1. 204.: ἐφορεία ἢ σύνοδος ἢ πρὸς τοῖς κοινοῖς ὅροις γινομένη τῶν ἀστυγετόνων, οὗ οἱ ὅμοροι συνιόντες περὶ τῶν κοινῶν βουλευόμενοι, which must not be limited to strictly confederate states.

⁶ Archæolog. 4. 45. a passage which has frequently been misinterpreted. No less erroneous is the view of the subject taken by Velleius, 1. 8. Iphitus.— eos ludos (Olymp.) mercatumque instituit.

gyres became divested of that private character, which is peculiar to the more frequented fairs of Germany, and became the affair of the states, which now sent Theori to them.

The panegyres, therefore, to be enumerated here, are either Amphictyonies wherein neighbours assembled like a private society, which, from its very nature, could not be extended beyond the circle of its own particular members, and in which these alone were recognised; or, those wherein a state was as it were invited by the host, and had the option of attending the festival or not; these under particular circumstances might lead to national festivals.

To the former kind belonged the AMARYNTHIA⁷ in Eubœa, in which the Dryopian Carystus⁸ likewise participated, but Chalcis and Eretria the principal members had no bond of union strong enough to prevent intestine war⁹. The Delia for the inhabitants of the Cyclades¹⁰; besides which there was another panegyris dedicated to Neptune and Amphitrite¹¹. The APATURIA of the Ionians in Asia; Colophon and Ephesus did not take any part in them¹²; but exclusions of this nature rested no more on strictly political grounds, than did the right to partake in them, and the celebration of

⁷ Strab. 10. 448; Liv. 35. 38; Paus. 1. 31. 3.

⁸ Thucyd. 7. 57; Diod. 4. 37; Herodot. (8. 45.) calls the Styreis Dryopians, though according to Thucyd. ub. sup. they were Ionians; Carystus appears singly, Thucyd. 1. 98: however, according to Liv. 35. 38. it took part in the panegyris.

⁹ Herod. 5. 99; Thucyd. 1. 15. But there was an agreement amongst the partakers in the Amarynthia not to use missile weapons against each other, Strab. 10. 448.

¹⁰ Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 147, sqq.; Thucyd. 3. 104; Strab. 10. 485; Paus. 4. 4. 1; Spanheim ad Callim. Hymn. Del. 325; Barthélemy, Anach. 6. 415, sqq.

¹¹ Strab. 10. 487.

¹² Herod. 1. 147.

festivals in general; for the most part a religious stigma was the ground of exclusion; thus the qualifications of the state as such were not considered, but only in its capacity of guest. The **TRIOPIA** of the six Doric cities Halicarnassus, Cnidus, Cos, and Lindus, Camirus, and Ialysus, situate on the island of Rhodes. But Halicarnassus was excluded from this union for the reason which has been just assigned¹³. The panegyris in Cyprus, near Palaipaphos¹⁴. The Bœotian by Onchestus¹⁵, which continued to subsist in the same age. The festal assembly of the Ozolian Locrians by Rhium¹⁶. The sacrificial communion of the Mantineans and Orchomenians¹⁷. The joint use of the temple of Artemis Limnatis for Messenians and Spartans¹⁸. The feast and games of the Triphylian Minyans, near the Samicum¹⁹. The festal union of the Italiots, near the temple of Here Lacidia²⁰.

The Panegyres of the *second* description were more or less shared in by the Greeks in general; athletic games were almost universally the principal amusement, and as these festivals were very numerous, every exertion was made to impart attraction to the games, which were attended by vast multitudes. The most popular of those which did not rise to the rank of strictly national feasts, were—The Panathenæa and Eleusinia in Attica; the Heraclea near Marathon, the Olympia;

¹³ Herod. 1. 147.¹⁴ Strab. 15. 683.¹⁵ See § 19. n. 15.¹⁶ Plut. Conviv. Sept. Sapient. 6. 619. R. ed.¹⁷ Paus. 8. 13. 1.¹⁸ Paus. 4. 4. 2.¹⁹ Strab. 8. 337. 343; Paus. 5. 6. 1; Müller, Orchom. 360, sqq.²⁰ Athen. 12. 541. A.; Liv. 24. 3.

in Eubœa, the Geræstia²¹, near Geræstus; in Bœotia, the Iolaea or Heracleia at Thebes; the Erotidia at Thespiæ; the Amphiaraiâ at Oropos; the Trophonia or Basilea at Lebadea; the Delia near Delium; at Megara the Dioclea, Pythia, and Nemea; at Corinth the Hellotia; at Argos the Heræa or Hecatombæa; at Sicyon the Pythia; in the Achæan Pellene the Theoxenia or Hermæa; in Arcadia the Lycæa amongst the Parrhasians; the Aleæa at Tegea; the Coreia at Cleiton; the Hermæa amongst the Pheneates; the Æacea²², Delphinia and Heræa in Ægina; the Isthmia in Syracuse²³.

Amongst the principal festal assemblies, which appear to have been common to the whole Greek nation, were

The Olympic Games.

The Panegyris at Olympia, originally, probably, a feast without athletic games, seems to have existed before the Doric migration to the Peloponnesus. It was at first superintended by the Laconian Achæans²⁴, and remodelled by Iphitus²⁵. At its renovation a cessation of hostilities was undoubtedly proclaimed²⁶ for the sharers in the feast, and continued in force for the period of its dura-

²¹ According to the Schol. Pind. O. 13. 159, for all the Geræstians; Boeckh proposes Eubœans instead, but that was the character of the Amarynthia; the Geræstia, on the other hand, might be visited by the inhabitants of other districts.

²² See Müller, Æginet. 140, n. y, and p. 18, sqq., on the reputed Panhellenion in Ægina.

²³ See the lists in Pind. Ol. 7. 151—159; 9. 129—151; 13. 151—160; Nem. 10. 74. 90, with the Scholia and Boeckh's explicat., especially on Ol. 7. p. 175. 176. Compare a similar enumeration of Simonides, Anthol. 13. 19, and Hygin. 273; compare at large Meurs. Græc. fer. under the heads of the several feasts.

²⁴ Strab. 8. 357.

²⁵ Paus. 5. 8. 2.

²⁶ See Müller, Dor. 1. 138, sqq.

tion. The discus²⁷ of Iphitus was exhibited as a sort of security for its observance. Whether this was proclaimed by Elis alone to the nations around, or whether these associated themselves with Elis for this object by treaty, as though assembling for an Amphictyony, is doubtful. At the time of its more perfect development, the festival seems to have been in the hands of the Eleans alone; they promulgated laws, regulating the order of the feast²⁸, proclaimed the armistice²⁹, and appointed the umpires³⁰, who were instructed in their duty by the Elean Nomophylaces³¹, and whose decisions might be set aside by the council in Elis³²; whereas, in a real Amphictyony, a general council would have been required. An original convention, as to festival and armistice, is, however, implied by the tradition concerning the conference between Lycurgus and Iphitus³³, which recounted that the feast itself, without being restricted to any particular place, or accompanied by athletic games, was, upon one occasion, when the partakers in it were prevented from going to Olympia, celebrated by the Spartans at home by means of a sacrifice³⁴. However this may be, it is certain that although the Eleans were afterwards the sole givers of the festival, such as were of Doric descent originally predominated; none but the Peloponnesian Dorians, with the Arcadians, were the immediate participators in it; and it is possible that the Achæans were excluded. Hence

²⁷ Paus. 5. 20. 1.

²⁸ Paus. 5. 9. 1.

²⁹ By means of the *σπονδοφόροι* Ἠλεῖοι, see Thucyd. 5. 50; Boeckh. and Dissen ad Pind. Isthm. 2. p. 494. 496.

³⁰ Ἑλλανοδίκαι, Paus. 5. 9. 4. 5; comp. Tittmann, griech. Staatsv. 386, p. 71.

³¹ Paus. 6. 24. 3.

³² Paus. 6. 3. 3.

³³ Paus. 5. 4. 4. Compare the accounts in the Fragm. Phlegon Trall. in the Thes. Gron. 9. 1294.

³⁴ Οἴκοι ἔθνον, Thucyd. 5. 49.

arose the tradition that Hercules, the genealogical hero of the Dorians, had instituted it³⁵; and on that account the Laconian Dioscuri were accounted the heroes of the games³⁶. However, it is manifest that the national name which here occurred in Zeus Hellanios³⁷, and Hellanodicæ, did not comprise the whole nation, but that it was principally from this point that it became so widely diffused³⁸; besides which, there can be no doubt, that upon the revival of the games after the lapse of two centuries, all the Greeks were looked upon as members of the festival, whilst barbarians were expressly forbidden to attend it³⁹. Its authority was at length greatly augmented by the active participation and hegemony of Sparta, the mistress in the gymnastic art.

The Eleans were, however, not satisfied with the actual importance the Panegyris afterwards attained, and with the accompanying armistice for its members. According to a tradition which bears indubitable marks of having emanated from them, the whole land of Elis was asserted to have been secured against hostilities by a convention between Oxylus and the Heraclidæ⁴⁰. But the name and lustre of the Olympic sanctuary do not begin historically till Iphitus. From the time of the dissolution of the political system of the ancient Achæans, it seems to have existed solely for the benefit of the Pisatans: it is certain that before Iphitus, the games were suspended, according to the tradition,

³⁵ Pind. Ol. 2. 5; 10. 72, sqq.

³⁶ Pind. Ol. 3. 63, sqq.

³⁷ Herod. 9. 7. 1.

³⁸ Compare above, § 13.

³⁹ Herod. 5. 22.

⁴⁰ Strab. 8. 357. 358; Polyb. 4. 73; Diod. Frag. v. 4. 18, Bipont.

from the time of Oxylus⁴¹ : but it is a question whether Oxylus at that time ruled over Pisatis ; nevertheless, the account of a consecration is not altogether unfounded. This consecration must be especially referred to the locality of the feast⁴², and in its most definite sense, to the grove Altis⁴³. Moreover, if troops marched through Elis, they were afterwards⁴⁴ compelled to pay a fine, but only during the celebration of the feast ; if the territory of the Eleans, however, really continued almost inviolate till the time of Epaminondas, this must be ascribed to the favour of circumstances, the vicinity of the peaceful Achæans, and the Arcadians, who were either powerless or disinclined to conquest, and perhaps also to a declaration of Sparta at the time of her hegemony, that by means of the protection of Elis, Messenia was secured towards the north. But it was almost a shameless assertion on the part of the Eleans, that they had not borne arms before the time of Philip⁴⁵ ; they, in fact, fought with advantage to themselves for the sovereignty of Pisatis and Triphylia⁴⁶, and for their common country against the Persians⁴⁷.

The Nemea and Isthmia were like the Olympia ante-Doric ; it was asserted that the former had been instituted by the seven princes against Thebes,

⁴¹ Paus. 5. 4. 4.

⁴² The Plateans were likewise declared ἄσυλοι and ἱεροὶ τῷ θεῷ, (Thucyd. 2. 71 ; Plut. Aristid. 21.) which did not apply to the state, but to the sanctuary in its vicinity.

⁴³ Pind. Ol. 3. 31, sqq. ; 8. 12 ; 10. 53, sqq., and Schol. 55 ; Isthm. 2. 42 ; Paus. 5. 10. 1 ; 6. 19. 1.

⁴⁴ Thucyd. 5. 49. 50 ; comp. n. 26.

⁴⁵ Paus. 4. 28. 3.

⁴⁶ Strab. 8. 355. 358 ; Paus. 5. 6. 3 ; 6. 22. 2 ; comp. Polyb. 4. 74 ; Diod. 15. 77. The opinion afterwards pronounced of them by Agis was, *τί δὲ ποιοῦσι θανασιόν, εἰ δὲ ἐτῶν τεσσάρων μὲν ἡμέρας χρωῶνται τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*, Plut. Lac. Apophth. 6. 808.

⁴⁷ Paus. 5. 4. 5.

as funeral games to the memory of Opheltes⁴⁸, and the latter, with no better foundation, by the Ionians⁴⁹ in honour of Melicertes, probably after their diffusion over the Isthmus with a view to an Amphictyony with Athens. Both, however, became Doric. The Nemea, according to the tradition, dedicated by Hercules to the Zeus of Nemea⁵⁰, were first of all intended for none but the Dorian military nobles⁵¹, and were under the joint superintendence of Argos, Corinth, and Cleonæ⁵². Corinth obtained the right to preside over the Isthmia⁵³; but the Athenians retained a place of honour⁵⁴, and were invited to the games even in time of war⁵⁵. The Eleans, on the other hand, had no share in them; the reason of this was referred to the mythological age⁵⁶. The Cypselidæ did not solemnise them⁵⁷, and thus they were suspended for seventy years.

The Pythia were more general. Their origin seems to have been a Panegyris, in connection with the Delphic oracle; with this the Delphians⁵⁸ combined games for the purposes of amusement, which originally consisted of a contest between singers in praise of the Delphic god⁵⁹. This assembly was, in its more important capacity, denominated the

⁴⁸ Apollod. 3. 6. 4; Hygin. 74; Argum. 4. Schol. Pind. Nem.; comp. on Pronax. Æl. V. H. 4. 5.

⁴⁹ Plut. Thes. 5; Hygin. 2; Zenob. 4. 38. Compare on the subject of the Nemea Vilhoison in the Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript. v. 35; on the Isthmia Massieu, *ibid.* v. 5.

⁵⁰ Στρατιωτικὸν γένος, *ibid.*

⁵¹ Argum. 3; comp. Paus. 2. 14. 2. On the ground of locality, Cleonæ possessed the most immediate, and, apparently, the original claim to it, comp. Plut. Arat. 40. Concerning the presidency of Argos in later times, see Liv. 34. 41.

⁵² Diod. 16. 60.

⁵³ Hellanicus and Andron, ap. Plut. Thes. 5.

⁵⁴ Thucyd. 8. 10.

⁵⁵ Paus. 5. 2. 2.

⁵⁶ Solin. 12.

⁵⁷ Strab. 9. 421.

⁵⁸ Paus. 10. 7. 2; Strab. *ubi sup.* On the Πυθικὸς νόμος, see Boeckh. Pind. Metr. 182. n.

Amphictyonic Council, and was charged with the superintendence of the games⁶⁰. This subject will be treated more fully below.

The passion of the Greeks for festal and athletic games, was not confined to the competitors themselves, but was equally conspicuous in the states to which they respectively belonged. These sent Theorias⁶¹; caused their names to be proclaimed upon the victory of one of their citizens⁶²; crowned the victor with garlands in honour of themselves⁶³, and paid him the highest testimonies of respect upon his return home⁶⁴. But how far these unions were from conducing to the establishment of political concord, is proved by the monuments erected at Olympia, commemorating the victories of Greeks over Greeks⁶⁵, and it is manifest that instead of forming a hearth of unity, they were a mere arena for egotism and ostentation, and ministered to the most disgraceful spirit of disunion. Their insignificance in comparison with truly patriotic exertions, was justly appreciated by Lycurgus the orator⁶⁶, and the great Alexander⁶⁷, who, upon beholding in Miletus the numerous statues of Olympic and Pythian victors, asked—where were those bodies when the barbarians besieged your town? and this ought long ago to have taught the moderns to descant with less prejudice and partiality on this common-place of empty declamation.

⁶⁰ Strab. ubi sup. According to a tradition, indeed, Amphictyon was the institutor of the games, Paus. 10. 33. 4.

⁶¹ Demosth. de Coron. 487, c. Mid. 552.

⁶² Pind. p. 1. 61; 9. 129; Sophocl. Elect. 626.

⁶³ Lysias de Aristoph. bonis, 662. ⁶⁴ e. g. see Paus. 7. 17. 6.

⁶⁵ Paus. 5. 24. 1. ⁶⁶ In Leocr. 176.

⁶⁷ Plut. Aristoph. 6. 684; comp. Demosth. Amat. 1408; Xenophanes, ap. Ath. 10. 413, C. D.; Vitruv. Præf. v. 9.

From the Panegyres in general, and especially the Pythia, the eye turns to the Delphic oracle, as a religious-political institution, which, it is natural to suppose, would have been a source of concord to the Greeks. It is a decided fact, that its high and generally-recognised authority was, like that of the Olympic games, the growth of the age which preceded the Persian wars, under the protection of the Dorians, and particularly Sparta, which at that time reposed implicit confidence in it. However, it was essentially deficient in an exclusively Grecian character. Lydians⁶⁸, Egyptians⁶⁹, Etruscans, and Carthaginians⁷⁰ had access to it, and met with honourable reception; in return for his donations, the liberal Cræsus and his Lydians were invested with the rights of Promanteia, Ateleia, and Proedria, and every Lydian who wished it, became a Delphian⁷¹. The Greek nation, however, did not regrad common access to the oracle as a means of concord; their questions seldom bore another character than that of egotism; and their relation might be illustrated by that of a friend and a foe gathering fruit in the same field, each endeavouring to defraud the other of his just share and proportion. The oracle was frequently consulted for the purpose of giving a tincture of justice to the designs of ambition⁷². Its responses were, through intentional ambiguity and insidious obscurity, as much adapted to promote selfishness and dishonesty in those who consulted it, as they were unsuited to

⁶⁸ Herod. 1. 14. 19; 46. 50, sqq.

⁶⁹ Ibid. 2. 180. ⁷⁰ Ibid. 1. 167; Diod. 19. 2.

⁷¹ Herod. 1. 54.—*ἐξεῖναι τῷ βουλομένῳ αὐτέων γενέσθαι Δελφὸν ἐς τὸν αἰὲ χρόνον.*

⁷² *Αἰολόστομοι χρησμοί* as early as in Æschyl. Prom. 661.

be safe rules of conduct for individuals and states. Still less was it able or willing to exercise a connected influence on the concerns of the Grecian states in themselves and amongst each other: its declarations were not those of a theocratical institution, acting of its own accord upon the public system with energy and vigour, but were merely the consequences of questions proposed, and the answer could seldom possess a more general interest than had been involved in the question, or do more than utter a command in matters which regarded futurity, and were beyond human control⁷³. Finally, those responses which contained political advice, were seldom impressed with the character of an interest in the general welfare of Greece; it is an honourable characteristic of the oracle of Olympia, that it gave no responses on wars between Greeks and Greeks⁷⁴. On the other hand, that of Delphi was not only willing to do so, but at the same time proved, by its treacherous ambiguity, that it was only intent upon its own advantage, and on providing for its own security at all events⁷⁵; or it visibly betrayed partiality, and, shameful to say, this might be propitiated with gold⁷⁶. But its readiness to receive Grecian trophies taken in domestic warfare, was more odious and pernicious than the same quality could possibly have been in Olympia⁷⁷.

⁷³ However, I willingly concede that the activity of the Delphic institution in sending out colonies, and in the direction of Sparta, formed an exception, see Müll. Dor. 1. 255, sqq.; comp. 1. 337. 341, and below, § 34, n. 28.

⁷⁴ Xenoph. H. 3. 2. 22.

⁷⁵ As in the response for Ægina against Athens, Herod. 5. 89.

⁷⁶ See on the bribes of the Alcæonidæ and Cleomenes, Herod. 5. 63. 90; 6. 65; Paus. 3. 4. 5.

⁷⁷ Paus. 10. 9. 3; 10. 10. 2; 10. 13. 3. etc., much of which should, doubtless, be referred to a later age.

b. Union of States with a Federal Council.

§ 23. None of the above-described festal communions appear to have been directed to the object of asserting the integrity of those invaluable political possessions, liberty and independence. Our attention must next be directed to those confederacies in which, though the people at large formed a panegyris, the representatives¹ of those individual states of the confederacy which had acceded to it of their own free will, constituted a general council, a central point of common authority (*κοινόν*). Unions of this description were found in several single provinces, whose inhabitants, like the provinces themselves, were consequently, designated by a common name; and amongst the most eminent must be reckoned that of the Amphictyons.

In several districts of Greece there existed confederacies of twelve towns; the number is significant, and was perhaps a political application of astronomical observations, and borrowed from the twelve months of the year. It seems to have been first employed by the Ionians, as a political division of the earliest ages; it subsisted amongst them when they were still in Achaia²; and, according to a conjecture expressed above³, a trace of it may be discovered amongst the Phæacians; further westward the researches of history find it

¹ *Πρόβουλοι*, Herod. 6. 7. of the Ionians; 7. 172. of the Greeks on the Isthmus in the Persian war. Comp. Aristot. Pol. 4. 11. 9; 4. 12. 8; 6. 5. 10. On the word *κοινόν*, see Append. viii. On the subject of the confederacies, consult Sainte-Croix sur les gouvernem. fédératifs, and Tittmann, gr. Staatsv. lib. 8.

² Strab. 8. 383.

³ § 13. n. 42.

amongst the Etruscans, and in the east amongst the Egyptians, etc.

The Ionians also appear to have established this subdivision in Attica⁴, which very soon assumed the character of a closely-connected state. It was adopted by the Achæans, when they occupied the Peloponnesian territory of the Ionians; the Ionians revived it in Asia, and it was likewise introduced amongst the adjacent Æolians.

The twelve towns of the Ionic confederation in Asia were Miletus, Myus, Priene, Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedos, Teos, Erythræ, Clazomenæ, Phocæa, Chios, and Samos⁵. The adjacent Magnesia, on the Mæander, erected by Thessalians, continued to stand alone, and therefore incurred the enmity of Ephesus⁶; but Smyrna, situate within the Ionian boundaries, became an object of contention to the Æolians and Ionians, and Colophon at one time obtained possession of it⁷; but it was soon afterwards destroyed by Alyattes the Lydian⁸. At the origin of the confederation, the validity of the heroic kingly principle is still perceptible when Phocæa is not allowed to join the league until it had received a prince of the line of Codrus⁹. The royal capital was originally

⁴ See below, § 43.

⁵ Herod. 1. 142.

⁶ Diog. L. 1. 117. 118; Ælian. V. H. 13. 26. On the Lydian conquest, see Suidas *Μάγνης*. Vatic. append. iv. xi.

⁷ From Strab. 14. 633. 634. compared with Herod. 1. 149. it would appear that the Ionians removed from a place near Ephesus, called Smyrna, to the city which was afterwards so denominated, and that this did not become Æolian till later, and again by means of Colophon, Ionian. In the confused account of Vitruv. 4. 1. stating that Melite, the thirteenth Ionian town, was destroyed by the other twelve; and that in its stead Smyrna afterwards became an Ionian confederate town through Attalus, Melite appears as the more ancient name.

⁸ Herod. 1. 16; Strab. 14. 646.

⁹ Paus. 7. 3. 5.

Ephesus¹⁰. The general council was annexed to the panegyris near the Panionium in Mycale¹¹, celebrated in honour of the Ionian Poseidon of Helice¹². No vestige has been preserved of any legal provision touching a majority in voting, or for the casting vote in case of equally divided numbers, except in the proverb of Colophon, the interpretation of which is very doubtful¹³. Resolutions of the general council will hardly be found before the rebellion against Darius¹⁴; mutual representation was not amongst the objects of the league; the Lydians conquered one town after another, and the confederacy took no steps to oppose them¹⁵. Upon the expedition of Cyrus, Thales proposed to institute a federal council, as though such a body had never existed till that period¹⁶; when his advice was rejected, Miletus made a separate treaty with Cyrus¹⁷. Intestine dissension broke out several times in the course of the war, for instance, between Chios, Miletus, and Erythræ¹⁸, Priene, Miletus, and Samos¹⁹. After their second subjugation by the Persians, Artaphernes, the satrap, compelled the Ionians to enter into treaties, to adjust their differences amicably, and not to

¹⁰ Βασιλείον, Strab. 14. 633.

¹¹ Herod. 1. 143.

¹² Strab. 8. 384.

¹³ Τὸν Κολοφῶνα ἐπιθεῖς in Suidas, and in Vatic. append. iv. xi. is interpreted with reference to the double vote of Colophon on account of the Smyrnæans resident there; but there is no authentic statement of their having been transplanted thither; according to Strab. 14. 646. the Smyrnæans, after the destruction of their town, dwelt κομηδόν. The other interpretation of the phrase, as relating to the decision of a battle by cavalry, is well known.

¹⁴ On the degree of credit to be attached to the account of Dionys. Halicar. comp. above, § 22, n. 5. The passage in Vitruv. before alluded to, has "Melite—*communi cōnsilio est sublatā*," with no less confusion in form than in substance.

¹⁵ Herod. 1. 14—18; Thuc. 1. 15.

¹⁶ Herod. 1. 170.

¹⁷ Ibid. 1. 169.

¹⁸ Herod. 1. 18; Polyæn. 8. 36.

¹⁹ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 185.

invade each other's territories²⁰. From Ionia let us turn to the two neighbouring districts.

The Æolian confederate towns of the mainland were Cuma, Larissa, Neon-Teichos, Temnos, Cilla, Notium, Ægiroessa, Pitane, Ægææ, Myrina, Gryneia, and for some time Smyrna²¹. An original compact may be inferred from their number. The expedition against the Colophonians, who had occupied Smyrna, and the distribution of the expelled Smyrnæans amongst the other eleven towns, appear to have been joint transactions²²; but there is no mention of a confederate sanctuary or panegyris; it is true something of the kind was attached to the temple of Apollo, at Gryneia²³; but that silence may be regarded as a proof of the absence of periodical consultation, and, in fact, the Æolians were no less destitute of strength than incapable of deliberation.

In Lesbos there were originally six Æolian cities, Mitylene, Methimna, Pyrrha, Cressos, Antissa, and Arisba²⁴. Whether any treaty of confederation was ever entered into is questionable. Arisba was soon reduced to subjection by Methimna²⁵; at a later period Mitylene and Methimna asserted a pre-eminence.

Amongst the towns of the Doric Hexapolis, one panegyris only is recorded, viz., the above-named Triopia. None but the Rhodian towns Lindus,

²⁰ Herod. 6. 42; *συνθήκας σφίσι αὐτοῖσι τοὺς Ἴωνας ἡνάγκασε ποιεῖσθαι ἵνα δωσίδικοι εἶεν καὶ μὴ ἀλλήλους φέροιεν τε καὶ ἄγοιεν.*

²¹ Herod. 1. 149.

²² Ibid. 1. 150.

²³ See Sainte-Croix *anciens gouvernem. fédérat.* 156.

²⁴ Strab. 13. 617, sqq.

²⁵ Herod. 1. 151.

Camirus, and Ialysus, were associated by political union.

In Achaia, the twelve towns Pellene, Ægeira, Ægæ, Bura, Helice, Ægium, Rhypes, Patræ, Pharæ, Olenus, Dyme, and Tritæa²⁶, had a panegyris with a federal council in the grove of Zeus Homagurios or Homarios²⁷, by Ægium. It is true internal distractions did not harass the Achæans till after the Persian wars; still they were very rarely united for the purpose of energetic action. The federal council in a later age pronounced a verdict against Helice, at the instance of the Ionians²⁸; but this was not carried into effect. Pellene and Patræ asserted the pre-eminence.

Lastly, in Acarnania there was, besides the panegyris near Actium²⁹, which can have possessed no political influence, a common tribunal near Olpæ³⁰; this was probably nothing more than an institution for the settlement of disputes with the northern neighbours. At the same time the Acarnanians proper, with the exception of the maritime town Cœniadæ³¹, which continued separate, appear to have held together; but they must be distinguished from the barbarians of the intermediate tract of country, and the Corinthian colonies Anactorium, Argos Amphilo-chium, and Ambracia.

²⁶ Herod. 1. 145; Strab. 8. 386; comp. Paus. 7. 6. 1, sqq.; and on the confederate towns of later times, Polyb. 2. 41.

²⁷ Paus. 7. 24. 2. The place ἐν Ὁμαρίῳ, Polyb. 5. 93. 10; in Strab. 8. 385, erroneously called Ἀρναρίῳ, see Casaub. ad loc. and Schweighaus. ad Pol. 2. 39. 6.

²⁸ Strab. 8. 385.

²⁹ Strab. 5. 225; Steph. Byz. Ἀκρία.

³⁰ Κοινὸν δικαστήριον, Thuc. 3. 105; and from thence Steph. Byz. Ὀλπαί.

³¹ Thuc. 3. 7.

Thus these confederate states of Greece, which were not associated by any kind of compulsion, were unions for deliberation, indeed, but very far removed from the principle of common agency and mutual representation. In political affairs of importance, the federal council seldom possessed binding efficacy; it was not a joint assembly, by which the cause of each state might be amicably adjusted or judicially decided. Even the most imminent danger could only produce concord in word and deed for a short time and imperfectly, whilst single towns of the confederacy formed separate alliances in peace and war.

c. The Amphictyonic Council.

§ 24. The picture presented by the preceding examination of the confederate relations amongst the single provinces, is repeated on an enlarged scale in the Amphictyons. This word, more correctly written *Amphictions*, was, as before observed¹, originally a designation for the dwellers in and around a certain district, *neighbours*, and an Amphictyony was a union of the same connected with some central point, which generally bore a religious character; afterwards it became a specific denomination for the council at Delphi. Not so much on account of the identity of name as of the character which conjecture has assigned them, I once more revert to those Amphictyonies which were cast into the shade by the Delphic,

¹ See § 19, n. 12. It is scarcely credible that the form 'Ἀμφικτύονες, which had become prevalent, instead of 'Ἀμφικτίονες, could ever have been made an argument in support of its derivation from a mythical 'Ἀμφικτύων.

and again refer to that of Calauria². This was originally Achæo-Ionic, and comprised Epidaurus, Nauplia, Hermione, Prasiæ, Ægina, Athens, and the Minyan Orchomenus³; the point of union was the temple of Poseidon, on the island. After the Dorians had entered the Peloponnesus, they endeavoured to appropriate the Amphictyony to themselves: Argos expelled the inhabitants of Nauplia, and took their place in the confederacy⁴; Sparta succeeded Prasiæ; the mythical fiction, that Calauria had once belonged to (the Doric) Apollo, and had devolved to Poseidon by exchange⁵, was intended to support the Doric principle. However, the Amphictyony, and even the panegyris, fell into disuse, if they ever existed, but the sanctuary of the temple retained its importance till a late age.

In reference to the Amphictyonic Council, properly so called, we may repeat, that in estimating the character of earlier Grecian institutions, it is necessary to guard against the error of supposing that the actual importance which they eventually attained, was the necessary consequence of some principle adopted at their foundation. The rise of the Amphictyonic confederacy must be referred to an age in which the political importance of the *tribe* took precedence of that of the *town*. The right to a share in it was based upon the principle of races⁶. This, and the fact that the habitations of most of its members bordered on each other, lead us to conclude that the confederacy took locality for its basis, and that it was here that the word Amphic-

² See § 19, n. 16.

³ Strab. 8. 374; Boeckh, Pub. Econ. 2. 368; Müller, Orchom. 247; Buttmann, über die Mīnyæ, p. 217.

⁴ Strab. ubi sup.; comp. Paus. 4. 24. 2; 4. 15. 2.

⁵ Paus. 2. 33. 3.

⁶ See Tittmann, Amphictyonen, p. 18.

tyons first obtained the general signification already adverted to⁷. Tradition, it cannot be denied, names Amphictyon, the son of Deucalion, as the founder of the league, and the occasion of its appellation⁸, and with sufficient consistency, as was remarked above⁹, Deucalion, the creator of the people after the deluge, is followed by Amphictyon, the inventor of unions amongst the tribes.

The original element may, with safety, be assumed in a primeval panegyris, which was, perhaps, limited to the dwellers in the immediate vicinity of Delphi¹⁰, and was exclusively of a religious-festal nature. But should it be asked, what occasioned the increase in the number of its members, as well as its most prominent characteristics, deliberation and the attendance of representatives, it may not be unsatisfactory to suppose a union amongst the dwellers in and around Thessaly, for the purpose of repelling the encroachments of the Thesprotian Thessalians, to whose subsequent entrance into the confederacy we shall afterwards more particularly allude. Thus considered, it cannot excite surprise that there were two places appointed for the annual assemblies of later times—one at Delphi and the other at Thermopylæ. The panegyris around Delphi was anterior to the settlement of the Thessalians; the establishment of the second assembly near Anthela, in the Pylæ¹¹, which was likewise connected with a sanctuary,

⁷ See Paus. 10. 8. 3. The word *Ἀμφικτύονες*, is interpreted the dwellers around Delphi by Anaximenes, ap. Harpocrat. *Ἀμφικτ.*; comp. Hesych. and Oros in the Etym. M. *Ἀμφικτ.*

⁸ See the testimonies in Tittmann, p. 11. 12.

⁹ See § 12, n. 26. 27.

¹⁰ Æschin. de falsa. Legat. 284. makes the building of the Delphic temple and the first Amphictyonic assembly contemporaneous.

¹¹ Herod. 7. 200; Suid. *πυλαγόρ*.

the temple of Demeter¹², from the importance of the position, and the fortifications constructed there by the Phocians, proves the real object contemplated to have been a political one¹³.

The ulterior development of this confederacy, which was probably at first but imperfectly constituted, must apparently be ascribed to the following facts.

Tradition narrated, that Acrisius of Argos new-modelled the league¹⁴. In the first place, it can scarcely be doubted that, in this instance, an event was removed, from the time that followed the Doric migration, back into the mythical age. Is it assuming too great a license to conjecture, that at the time of the struggle between Argos and Sparta for the supremacy of the Peloponnesus, the former allied itself to the northern states, and that the restoration of the Olympic games by Lycurgus, and the friendly relations into which he entered with the Arcadians and Eleans, who had no share in the Amphietyonic league, were intended as a counterpoise? The inactivity of the Spartans in the Crissæan war, leads us to suppose that their connection with the Delphic oracle was not so intimate as it soon afterwards became.

An important influence upon the form the confederacy afterwards assumed, must, however, have been exercised by the Crissæan war, which is represented in the traditions extant as solely caused

¹² Compare the conjecture of Müll. Dor. 1. 26, that a combination of the Pelasgic worship of Demeter, with the Pythian worship of the Hellenes, was effected by the Amphietyons.

¹³ Herod. 7. 176. To this must be referred the statement, that Strophius, the son of Crisus, instituted the assembly at the Pylæ, Schol. Soph. Trach. 640; comp. Liban. 3. 472. R. Fréret, in the Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript. 47. 72. 74.

¹⁴ Strab. 9. 420.

by it. It is a remarkable fact, that whilst Sparta remained supine and inactive, Thessaly and Athens were the principal enemies of Crissa, and Clisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon, and the opponent of Argos¹⁵, took the lead¹⁶. This is indeed an inducement for us to assume an attack upon the Doric principle: but it is insufficient to explain the share the oracle had in the war, which became a holy one in consequence, and the truth may be approached by a surer road. The whole war against Crissa is, apparently, ascribed to the Amphictyonic league, with that attachment to proper names which characterised the Greeks upon all occasions, whilst, in all probability, it really pertained to some of the dwellers around Crissa, Amphictyons in the original sense of the word. In the traditions relating to this war, Crissa is described as obnoxious to the charge of arrogance and impiety¹⁷. But it was at one time entitled to respect¹⁸. Suppose we were to assume that it had carried on the war with particular energy against the Thessalians, who were already upon an amicable footing with the more southern districts, Athens, for instance, or that it had grown dangerous to the tyrant of Sicyon by its naval power, and finally, had, through its supremacy, alarmed the jealousy of the oracle and the rest of the Phocians, who were, apparently, parties to the war against it. There exist but partial and disfigured fragments on the subject of the war¹⁹; it is impossible to clear up all the obscurity in which the subject is involved, but it may be asserted with

¹⁵ Herod. 5. 67.

¹⁶ Plut. Sol. 11.

¹⁷ Plut. ubi sup. Callisthenes, ap. Ath. 13. 560. C.

¹⁸ Hom. Il. 2. 520. *Κρίσσαν τε Ζαθήην*.

¹⁹ Plut. and Paus. ubi sup. Æschin. 498, sqq.

great probability, that the energetic Clisthenes was the soul of the enterprise; that the share taken by Athens was brought about by Cleisthenes' son-in-law, Megacles²⁰, son of the Athenian commander, Alcmaeon²¹; and that, on the other side, the Thessalians were ever ready to assail their hereditary enemies, whilst the oracle provided for its own independence by causing a donation of the conquered country to be made to itself; and finally, that the Thessalians were, from motives of gratitude, received into the Amphictyonic league, perhaps in the place of the Crissæans, whilst the league itself, after the disappearance of Crissa, possessed in Delphi a more strongly marked and salient point of union.

The number of the confederate states after that time may, according to the successful attempt of Tittmann²² to reconcile the conflicting statements of the ancients²³, be safely fixed at twelve: viz., Thessalians, Bœotians, Dorians, Ionians, Perrhæbians, Magnesians, Locrians, Ætæans or Ænians, Phthiotan Achæans, Malians, Phocians, and Delphians.

That the two annual meetings, in spring and autumn²⁴, were not mere panegyres, but assemblies of the council, is proved by the sending of representatives from the confederate states, called Pylagoræ and Hieromnemons²⁵, the latter of whom, by virtue of the religious tendency of the confedera-

²⁰ Herod. 6. 130. ²¹ Plut. Sol. 11; comp. Boeckh. Pind. Expl. 301.

²² See Amphict. cap. 3.

²³ The chief passages are Æsch. ubi sup. 285; Paus. 10. 8. 2; Harpocr. Ἀμφικτύονες.

²⁴ Strab. 9. 420.

²⁵ Tittmann, 83, sqq.; comp. Demosth. de Falsa. Legat. 380. 19: ὥστε μήτε τοὺς ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς θεωροῦς, μήτε τοὺς θεσμοθέτας εἰς τὰ Πύθια πέμψαι.

tion presided ²⁶: formal regulations for voting were likewise made ²⁷. Sometimes a sort of great council, or popular assembly, was convened, consisting of the people collected there for religious objects, the use of the oracle, and celebration of the festival ²⁸. Now on the strength of this assembly other Greeks, besides those belonging to the races represented, obtained admission it is true; but this was never extended into a general assembly of all the Greeks, and the expressions of the ancients ²⁹, from which it has been attempted to represent the Amphictyonic confederation as such in the light of a Greek national assembly, will not bear the test of historical scrutiny. In the primitive age the political importance of the confederacy was considerable in consequence of the principle laid down at its formation, viz., that of tribes; this must of necessity have declined upon the rise of the new states; therefore for centuries there was at most but doubtful or suspicious mention of the Amphictyons, who during that period can hardly be said to have formed a league: it is not till after the Crissean war that they are beheld in a clearer light. But at all times their agency was impressed with a religious character ³⁰; some of their international ordinances alone bear a political impress, and in reference to these the celebrated old formula

²⁶ Tittm. 86.

²⁷ Æsch. 286; comp. Tittm. 73—75.

²⁸ Æsch. in Ctesiph. 515: τοὺς συνθύοντας καὶ χρωμένους τῷ θεῷ—στρατὸς Ἀμπικτυόνων has probably the same signification. Pind. p. 10. 12.

²⁹ Κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων συνέδριον. Demosth. de Coron. 279; Æsch. in Ctesiph. 549; Commune Græciæ concilium Cic. de Divinat. 1. 23; comp. the erroneous opinion of Dionys. Halic. 4. 25.

³⁰ Frérét, ubi sup. 47. 71. considers them to have been exclusively destined for religious objects. Comp. Tittmann, 99—101; Müller, Dor. 1. 261. This character was first annexed to the oracle and the Pythian panegyris, it is true; but it afterwards extended still farther; e. g. see Ath. 4. 173. the regulation that the Eleodytæ at Delos should present water.

of oath is still extant³¹. Lastly, in the accounts of the ancients concerning the intervention of the Amphictyons, the antiquity of the word has served to exhibit the confederacy in a false light, inasmuch as we are not to understand the league, but the dwellers around a country (*ἀμφικτῖνες*) which was interested in an affair; this moreover coincided with the general practice of the Greeks, to connect various objects with a common point for the convenience of reference, and this in a certain degree is perceptible in the accounts of the Crissean war; but totally unconnected with the confederation are the judgment of Amphictyons in the battle of Thyra³², the institution of the asylum on Samos³³, and the Amphictyonic Phyle in Thurii³⁴, which must be understood of the inhabitants of such countries as were concerned in the affairs. Still less can a connection be established between the confederation and a general council of the Greeks, like that in the case of Themistocles³⁵. But where its operation is established beyond all doubt, it is confined to questions of international law, with the exception of a few instances, in which the authority of Athens and Sparta are already perceptible, and they are the real agents, such as the banishment of Ephialtes, the betrayer of his country, and the erection of the monument at Thermopylæ³⁶. To this class belonged the sentence pronounced against the piratical Dolopes on the island of Scyros³⁷, which was carried into effect by Athens;

³¹ Æschin. de Fals. Legat. 284.³² Ps. Plut. Parall. 7. 218. R.³³ Tacit. Ann. 11. 14.³⁴ Diod. 12. 11.³⁵ Diod. 11. 55.³⁶ Herod. 7. 196; 8. 288.³⁷ Plut. Cim. 8.

and even in this case it could only lay claim to the shadow, whilst the substance was engrossed by the Athenians. In the meridian of Grecian prosperity, the confederacy neither evinced any desire to obtain greater influence, nor was any disposition manifested by the most eminent of the Grecian races, to invest it with greater authority: it neither proved a common tribunal, nor a collective council against external enemies; the greater part of its members fought for Xerxes, whilst his adversaries held a Synedrion on the Isthmus.

d. Mutual Hospitality and the Interchange of Civil Rights.

§ 25. This relation formed an intermediate grade between the lax ties of festive pleasure and of the council, which have hitherto formed the subject of our consideration, and the actual union by means of military alliance and hegemony, to which we shall afterwards direct our attention.

When the public hospitality annexed to the person of the prince terminated with the heroic monarchy, it became the affair of the community which thenceforward constituted the state¹, to assume the same as a political inheritance. It is true, that through the narrower and more determinate signification attached to citizenship, and the pride it inspired, the position of foreigners in the scale of importance, necessarily became lower

¹ The Spartan kings certainly had a right to choose Proxenoι for the state (Herod. 6. 57); but the hospitality which they themselves exercised, only regarded them individually. See Paus. 3. 8. 2: *Ξενίας δὲ ἀνὴρ Ἑλλήιος Ἀγιδί τε ἰδίᾳ ξένος καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων τοῦ κοινοῦ πρόξενος*. By the same principle Sparta's treaty of hospitality with the Pisistratids did not extend to the Athenian state.

than it had been in the earlier ages, when they possessed more powerful support in the divine law; and where this principle was most rigorously developed, as in Sparta, it led to inhospitality². But in a great number of states there was not only every moral disposition on the part of the community at large, and of individuals to exercise the duties of hospitality towards strangers³, but they were more firmly established in general, by means of political order and security, a step was put to depredations, intercourse with strangers promoted by increased facilities for travelling, and the institution of asylums, and a substitute provided for the declining patriarchal piety. At the same time in lieu of the royal hospitality, the notion of a large civil family comprising every member of the state, generated a comprehensive scheme of public hospitality, exercised by individuals in the name of all, and called Proxenia. Its origin is derived from the time when a citizen, either from inclination or interest, treated the members of another state⁴ with hospitality, and took upon himself the charge of giving them a friendly reception in his own country, and officiating as their political representative⁵; a speedy consequence of this was, that states for the purpose of facilitating the intercourse of their own citizens with other countries,

² *Ξενηλασία*, Herod. 1. 65; Plut. Lyc. 27; Xenoph. Repub. Lac. 14. 4; Photius, *Ξενηλαεῖν*.

³ The Andraia of Crete were renowned, Dosiad. ap. Ath. 4. 143. C.; the Pontic Phasis, Heracl. Pont. 18; Corinth, Athens, Byzantium, etc. are likewise called hospitable.

⁴ *Ἐθελοπρόξενος*. As at a late period Pithias in Corcyra for Athens. Thucyd. 3. 70; Gellius in Agrigentum, Diod. 13. 83; comp. Ulrich de Proxenia, Berl. 1822. p. 7.

⁵ Comp. Poll. 3. 59: ὁ μὲν πρόξενος, ὅταν πόλειως δημοσίᾳ προξενῇ τις ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει ὧν, ὡς ὁποδοχῆς τε τῶν ἐκείθεν φροντίζειν καὶ προσόδου πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, καὶ ἔδρας ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ.

undertook the Proxenia, for the citizens of other states, with which they thus indirectly established relations of friendship; and at length it became the care of the state, publicly to appoint citizens to perform the duties of Proxenia⁶. These Proxenoi might be compared to the consuls of the present day, if these instead of belonging to the state they represent, appertained to that in which they are the representatives of the other. The Proxenos naturally entered into the closest connection with the state, which confided in him, and this was looked upon as his second country⁷. This was the true nature of the relation, and in its main points the Proxenoi appear almost universally to have belonged to that state in which they represented another⁸; nevertheless citizens were sent to other parties than the Proxenoi, and this relation in Athens was subsequently associated with legal rights which ranked next to those of real citizenship⁹, and individuals and collective states were at length presented with the Proxenia, as a privilege but little inferior to the civic right itself¹⁰. Therefore when the subject of Xenia between states, as that between Miletus and Athens, Miletus and Sybaris¹¹ is treated of, no other relation is to be understood than that which provided the reciprocal observance of the Proxenia; however Xenia

⁶ Schol. Aristoph. *Therm.* 583; Schol. *Thucyd.* 3. 70; comp. Valcken. ad *Ammon.* *πρόξενος*; Ulrich, p. 45. and 48. n. 46.

⁷ Plato, *Leg.* 1. 642. B.

⁸ e. g. Callias' family in Athens Proxenoi for Sparta, *Xenoph. Hell.* 5. 4. 22; 6. 3. 4; comp. Plato, *Leg.* 1. 642. B. C. on Megillus; *Diod.* 13. 27. on Nicias; *Æschin.* in *Ctesiph.* 647. on Arthmius of Zelia.

⁹ Boeckh. *Pub. Econ.* 1. 55. 155; 2. 78; Meier und Schöm. *Att. Proc.* 55. 56.

¹⁰ Dem. in *Lept.* 475. 10; 497. 3. sqq.; Gruter, *Inschrift.* 400. 401.

¹¹ Herod. 6. 21.

seems to be a more general notion than Proxenia, which was as it were a channel for it. Neither of them was however directed to the express determination of mutual concessions, but to the maintenance of friendly intercourse in general, and consequently to the tacit acquiescence in amicable adjustment in case of disputes. Express treaties converted the last into relations¹², which through the influence of a pre-eminent state like Athens¹³, might become a means to oppress the less powerful members of a confederacy. The conferring of single rights was determined by treaties to that express effect, even though mere verbal agreements, and by a specific enumeration of the rights in question; the assumption that the enjoyment of them was even in the earliest ages regarded as the growth of circumstances is wholly untenable; however upon the whole, clear and determinate principles for their regulation do not seem to have been laid down till afterwards, when the subject of right in general became more thoroughly understood. Moreover, it was natural that in conferring a single right, which is to a certain extent implied by the very acquisition of its object, a representation in general, like that provided by the Proxenia, must have been less needed, wherefore these single concessions are not comprised under that relation.

They consist of:—

Intermarriage, ἐπιγαμία. When one state granted

¹² Σύμβολα, Ps. Demosth. de Halonn. 78. 25; 79. 13. 17; in Mid. 570. 18; comp. Harpocr. σύμβ. The subject is treated at length by Heffter, Athen. Gerichtsverf. 90—93; Meier u. Schömb. Att. Proc. 773—780.

¹³ Hesych. ἀπὸ συμβόλων δικάζεσθαι· ἐδίκαζον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπὸ συμβόλων, τοῖς ὑπηκόοις, καὶ τοῦτο ἦν χαλεπόν.

this to another, the right in question did not consist in the permission granted by the state to one of its citizens to choose a wife from the former, but from an opinion that it was expedient to keep the intrinsic qualities of the citizenship¹⁴, as once those of families, exclusive, in rendering it a lawful proceeding to marry one of the daughters of the state into that community, which was concerned in the treaty. For that reason Epigamia might often have been granted by a more powerful state as a mark of favour; but reciprocity followed of course¹⁵.

The possession of houses and land, ἐγκτησις¹⁶. An important advance towards the essential principle of citizenship, the right of permanent residence¹⁷.

Exemption from taxation, ἀτέλεια, generally from every kind of impost¹⁸, from duties¹⁹, and particularly from the tax imposed on resident aliens, ἀτέλεια μετοικίου²⁰. The former was possessed by the Deceleans in Sparta, the kings Leucon, Sitalces, Evagoras in Athens²¹; the latter must be regarded as a privilege confined to individuals; in the same manner the footing upon which the Isoteles²² stood in Athens, was totally unconnected with the question of a political relation between Athens and their country.

¹⁴ But express prohibitions of Epigamia, as between the Attic Demes, the Pallænæans, and Agnusians, (Plut. Thes. 13.) as between Andros and Paros, (Plut. Qu. Gr. 92; 7. 193.) were generally occasioned by particular circumstances.

¹⁵ Thus Xenoph. Hell. 5. 2. 19. ἐπιγαμίαις καὶ ἐγκτήσεσι παραλλήλαις.

¹⁶ See the illustrative passages in Meier u. Schömb. Att. Proc. 491. n. 40.

¹⁷ Boeckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 154; comp. below § 33. n. 34.

¹⁸ Ἀτέλεια ἀπάντων, Demosth. in Lept. 475. 10.

¹⁹ Wolf Præf. Demosth. Leptin. LXXI. n. 46; Boeckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 93.

²⁰ Boeckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 354.

²¹ Herod. 9. 73; Wolf, Lept. LXXIV. n. 51.

²² Comp. § 46. n. 28.

All this was comprised under the right of *citizenship in general*, πολιτεία, ἰσοπολιτεία, which was of course only brought into full operation when a citizen of that state, to which such a right had been granted, took up his residence in the state with which amicable relations had been contracted²³. This was not always reciprocal; but there is no dearth of examples to prove that it frequently was so²⁴, and it may easily be supposed that the state thus favoured by a more powerful one very readily gave its own citizenship in return.

An appendage to the citizenship, or even to one of the inferior rights, such as the Ateleia²⁵, was the rank termed *Proedria*²⁶, and the privilege of being called *public benefactor*, εὐεργεσία²⁷.

There are few examples of one of the rights here enumerated having been conferred singly, and even the Politeia does not appear so much to have comprised all the rest, as to have been used for a single right, for one or more of those included under it are frequently particularised²⁸. That this mode of classing them together was customary, is proved by the indefinite manner in which the terms

²³ Comp. the account in Xenoph. Hell. 1. 2. 10. of the Ephesians giving the Syracusians ἀτελείαν. Σελινουσίους δὲ, ἐπεὶ ἡ πόλις ἀπολώλει, καὶ πολιτείαν ἔδωσαν.

²⁴ Timæus ap. Polyb. 12. 10. says there existed decrees between the Locrians in Italy and in Greece, καθ' ἃ πολιτείαν ὑπάρχειν ἑκατέρους παρ' ἑκατέρους. Calydon had citizenship in Achaia, Xen. Hell. 4. 6. 1; the Boeotian Harma in Argos, Strab. 9. 404; Lebadeia in Arcadia, Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 199; Syracuse in Antandros, Xen. Hell. 1. 1. 26. but without reciprocity.

²⁵ As in the case of the Deceleans, n. 21.

²⁶ Demosth. de Coron. 256. 7; comp. § 22. n. 68; Hemsterh. ad Poll. 8. 133.

²⁷ Xenoph. Hell. 1. 1. 26: εὐεργεσία τε καὶ πολιτεία Συρακουσίοις ἐν Ἀντάνδρῳ ἴστί. Comp. Wolf ad Dem. Lept. p. 282.

²⁸ They are enumerated in detail in the decree of the Byzant. Dem. de Coron. 256. 6, sqq.: — Ἀθηναίοις δόμεν ἐπιγαμίαν, πολιτείαν, ἐγκτασιν γᾶς καὶ οἰκῶν, προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι, πόθοδον ποτὶ τὰν βωλὰν καὶ τὸν δᾶμον, πρῶτοις μετὰ τὰ ἱερὰ, καὶ τοῖς κατοικεῖν ἐθέλουσι τὰν πόλιν ἀλειτουργήτοις ἦμεν πασῶν προστακτῶν λειτουργιῶν (therefore ἀτέλειαν) κ. τ. λ.

are employed, one frequently being used for the other²⁹, and some individually specified appearing to include others³⁰.

e. Associations for the purposes of united agency.

§ 26. No less characteristic of the Greeks in general, than the tendency to festive pleasure, were the love of war and a grasping spirit of conquest. As this on the one hand, by the multiplication of feuds, deprived Greece of the blessings of internal peace, it on the other led to the formation of more or less extended unions. Most of these unions were not like those already enumerated, mere assemblies for the celebration of festivals, or for deliberation and friendly intercourse, but associations for the purpose of common and united agency. The seeds of their origin may have existed in custom, treaty, or the ascendancy of a powerful state; and one or more of these causes may have consolidated them; a strict line of distinction cannot be drawn in all cases.

The custom of united agency seems to have obtained in various provinces of Greece; the insulated character of such districts may undoubtedly have had a considerable share in producing this result; however, it is possible that we only want express accounts of positive conventions, and we may almost always assume the influence of some

²⁹ Thus Demosth. in Aristocr. 687. 4. mentions *Politeia*; in the spurious speech *περὶ συνταξ*, 173. 6. 7. *Ἀτέλεια* occurs in the sense of the privilege bestowed by Athens on the Pharsalian Menon and the Macedonian Perdiccus. Comp. Wolf Lept. LXXIV. 51. where however the subject is not quite embarrassed of the difficulties involved in it.

³⁰ Demosth. de Coron. 291. 4. 5. in speaking of the alliance between Athens and Thebes, only names *συμμαχίαν* and *ἐπιγαμίαν*: but there can be no doubt that it comprised more than this.

pre-eminent race or city. Of this nature were the Opuntian Locris, from which the Epicnemidian was not separated till some time afterwards¹; the Ozolian Locris, in which Amphissa exercised the right of presidency, but was not entitled to employ coercive measures²; Ætolia, whose stricter union by formal compact, however, must be referred to a much later age; the abodes of the mountain races around Thessaly, namely, the Malians, whose three tribes³ lived in uninterrupted harmony; Doris, amongst whose four cities Cytnium, Bœon, Erineus, and Pindus, or Acyphas⁴, no instance of dissension is recorded; and lastly, Phocis. The close alliance amongst the Phocians is proved by the powerful stand they made against the attacks of the Thessalians⁵; but this internal union was at length dissolved by the encroachments of Crissa, and subsequently of the Delphians, who afterwards appear as decidedly opposed to their neighbours⁶. The most considerable amongst the twenty-two towns of the district that still continued to hold together were Elatea, Abæ, Daulis, Panopeus, Hyampolis, Ambryssus, Drymæa, Lilæa, Parapotamioi, and Anticirrha⁷. The house of congress called Phocicum⁸ most probably belongs to a very late age.

Armed confederacies, not limited to inhabitants

¹ See § 13. n. 27.

² Thucyd. 3. 101. : Ἀμφισσῆς — τοῦς ἄλλους ἔπεισαν.

³ See § 13. n. 16.

⁴ Strab. 9. 417, and 427; comp. Poppo, Thucyd. 2. 299. 300; Müller, Dor. 1. 36.

⁵ Herod. 7. 176; 8. 27. 28; Strab. 9. 422; Paus. 10. 1. 2, sqq. 13. 3; Æschin. de Falsa Legat. 308; Ps. Plut. de Mulier. Virtut. 7. 7. R. ed.; comp. 10. 524.

⁶ Thucyd. 1. 112; Plut. Pericl. 21.

⁷ Paus. 10. 3. 2; comp. 10. 4. 1. and 5. 10. 32, sqq. ⁸ Paus. 10. 5. 2.

of the same district, nor perpetuated by permanent ties, or such as were renewed by each successive generation, but associated by the emergencies of the time for enterprise and action, and consequently unattended by fixed periodical meetings of any deliberative body, repeatedly occur in the course of Grecian history. The exact nature of these alliances, and of the force by which they were cemented cannot in all cases be determined; their extension, responsibility, and duration, depended upon circumstances; and no very clear notions of the nature of alliances either offensive or defensive⁹ seem to have been entertained. A complete enumeration of them is not compatible with our object. The character of the warlike confederacies amongst the heroes that went in quest of adventures, is continued in the migrations of the allied Dorians, Ætolians, and others to the Peloponnesus; afterwards in the maritime expeditions for the foundation of new states, as well as in the foreign service of the Cretan and other mercenaries¹⁰. In these the state was seldom concerned. Thucydides mentions as the most extensive amongst the political alliances, properly so called, the armed league, formed by the inhabitants of the coast-districts, in the war between Chalcis and Eretria, in Eubœa¹¹; in the interior the Messenian wars caused a widely disseminated division amongst the Peloponnesians who took part in them¹². The relation between Tegea and Sparta

⁹ Συμμαχία, alliance offensive and defensive, Thucyd. 6. 11.; ἐπιμαχία, defensive only, 1. 44; 3. 70; 5. 48.

¹⁰ Paus. 4. 8. 1; 4. 10. 1; 4. 19. 3.

¹¹ Thucyd. 1. 15; comp. Herod. 5. 99.

¹² Paus. 4. 10. 1; 4. 11. 1; 4. 15. 4; 4. 19. 1.

assumed the character of a permanent alliance in war¹³. The league formed by Thebes and Chalcis against Athens¹⁴ is worthy of remark, as presenting the earliest indications of the constitutional spirit. The league against Athens bears an oligarchical character, Athens' victory brought about the overthrow of the Chalcidian Hippobotæ, and after the alliance between Ægina and the Thebans, the insurrection of the demagogue Nicodromus in Ægina¹⁵, Miletus received assistance from Eretria in return for that which it had afforded¹⁶. Finally, to adduce a remote example, the same is observable when the Spartans recommended the Locrians in Italy to admit the DioscURI into their confederacy¹⁷, without marching out themselves.

Allied to these voluntary associations, so far as the principle of common agency was concerned, but distinct from them, inasmuch as commands were issued on the one side, and obedience was yielded on the other, was the union by means of *Hegemony*, a relation developed amongst the Grecian states before the Persian war; but which often bore the appearance of a confederacy, in the manner of a Roman "*foedus iniquum*," with which it in fact corresponded; when one of the members raised itself above and directed the rest¹⁸, "*de facto*," without any actual violation of what was established by prescription or treaty. But it was a different case, when

¹³ Herod. 9. 26. However the Tegeatans do not appear to have been parties to the war against Messenia. See Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 172. R.

¹⁴ Herod. 5. 75, sqq. ¹⁵ Ibid. 6. 88, sqq. ¹⁶ Ibid. 5. 99.

¹⁷ Justin. 20. 2.

¹⁸ Τελεῖν εἰς Βοιωτοῖς, κ. τ. λ. (Herod. 6. 108.) does not precisely express an equality of rights in the confederates; but the state of dependence is clearly conveyed by συντελεῖν. Thucyd. 2. 15; 7. 76; Isocrat. Plat. 516; Strab. 8. 364; Diod. 12. 41. On the word τελεῖν compare Append. xiv.

such a state only asserted a sort of honorary pre-eminence, or when a powerful state did not exactly force others to a participation in its measures, but infringed one of their rights by asserting a dominion over the sea; for instance, like Chios¹⁹ and Ægina²⁰, not to mention Castor's pretended empire of the sea in earlier times; or like the Rhodians²¹, by the blockade of a commercial channel, the taxation of emigrants, etc. The claims of hegemony were almost universally directed to military alliance, though they were often coupled with relations of a still more oppressive nature. The gradations from the most relaxed to the strictest species of dependence, and even to the total dissolution of the separate existence of a state, may be described as 1. The taxation of the dependent state. 2. The demand of subsidies and supplies, and the command of the contingents. 3. Paramount jurisdiction, the regulation of the magistracy, and general interference with internal matters; as, for example, when the Mitylenæans forbade such of their confederates as had fallen off from the league, to allow their children to learn writing and music²², but which is entirely distinct from the intervention of a state as arbitrator between two others, upon an invitation to that effect. This is then the boundary beyond which it was impossible for a dependent state to assert a separate existence, and its citizens, either by adoption into the citizenship²³, or subjection to

¹⁹ Strab. 14. 645.

²⁰ Herod. 5. 83, sqq.; Strab. 8. 375.

²¹ Euseb. Canon. 1099.

²² Æl. V. H. 7. 15. This probably refers to the towns on the coast opposite to Lesbos, *ἀκραῖαι*, concerning which see Thucyd. 4. 52, and n.

²³ *Συννοικισμός*, Thuc. 3. 23. The remark of the Schol. on 3. 2. 1. 5. p. 376. Bipont.: τὸ ζυνώκισεν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁμοῦ ζυννοικισθῆναι ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ'

the state of Periœci, became constitutive portions of the commanding state.

Hegemony was naturally connected with unions amongst the towns of a district, vicinity, community of race, and the rank of mother state, several of which characteristics might be found united.

That city which was illustrated by the glory of the heroic princes, or which had become the seat of the new dynasty, continued to exercise a supremacy over the inhabitants of the surrounding district, even after the rise of republican institutions. Bœotia and Thessaly are particularly to be considered here.

In Bœotia there was a confederacy of towns; all the towns in that country were not immediately connected with it, but many of them were subject to one of the confederate towns, like kindred places: thus Leuctra, Thisbe, Siphæ, and Creusis, were under Thespiæ; Delium for some time under Tanagra²⁴; but Thebes, which was desirous of being regarded as a mother-state²⁵, possessed such a decided and oppressive preponderance in the league, that it degenerated into the nature of a Hegemony; and on that account Plataea, a short time before the Persian wars, in order to liberate itself from the usurped authority of Thebes, entered into an alliance with Athens²⁶. The remaining cities of the confederation can be pointed out with certainty in part only, as, for instance, Thespiæ, Orchomenus, Tanagra, Haliartus, Coronea, and Lebadea; to

ἐπὶ τοῦ μίαν πόλιν, τουτέστι μητρόπολιν ἔχειν αὐτήν, more especially relates to the act of dwelling together in the country.

²⁴ See in general Müller, Orchom. 402, sqq., and his article Bœotia in Ersch. und Grub. Encyclop. vol. 11. p. 270, 271.

²⁵ Thucyd. 3. 61.

²⁶ Herod. 6. 108; Thucyd. 3. 55. 61, sqq.

these conjecture adds Copæ, Antheden, Chalia, Onchestus, and Chæronea²⁷, but not as all appertaining to it at the same time, or each continuously. The league appears in the character of an armed confederation, the federal cities sent contingents of troops commanded by Bæotarchs²⁸: the nature and functions of the four deliberative bodies²⁹ mentioned by Thucydides are not thoroughly understood, and it is doubtful whether they existed before the Persian wars. The Pambœotia³⁰, solemnised in honour of the Itonic Athene by Coronea, were perhaps originally accompanied by deliberations of the federal council; but after the Hegemony of Thebes was firmly established, they were divested of political influence. The Dædala³¹, like the Pannegyris of Onchestus³², seem to have been exclusively devoted to festive objects.

The Thessalians were likewise associated by a military alliance, under a commander called Tagos³³; this was in all probability accompanied by a confederate council; but like Thebes in Bœotia, Larissa, the seat of the ancient regal line of the Aleuadæ, asserted an ascendancy till the Persian wars; however, the Tagos seems to have been likewise chosen from other towns, such as Gonnoi³⁴. Besides Larissa, in the course of time Pharsalus and Pheræ rose into importance: in a less degree

²⁷ Müller, ubi sup.; Comp. Klütz. de fœd. Bæot. 16, 17.

²⁸ Müller, in the Encyclop. 271.

²⁹ Thucyd. 5. 38.

³⁰ Strab. 9. 411; comp. Meurs. Græc. fer. in Gronov. Thes. 7. 833.

³¹ Paus. 9. 3. 4; comp. Müller, Orchom. 221, sqq.

³² Comp. § 19. n. 14.

³³ Tagos, Thucyd. 4. 78; Xen. Hell. 6. 1. 6.

³⁴ In Herod. 5. 63. The Thessalians sent some knights and τὸν βασιλῆα τὸν σφέτερον Κινέην, ἄνδρα Κομμαῖον, to the assistance of the Pisistratidæ. To understand in this place with Schweighæuser a Phrygian term, instead of reading Κομμαῖος, will appear to others beside myself a very questionable proceeding.

Crannon, Gomphi, and Gyrtion³⁵; but at the same time the unity of Thessaly was dissolved. The division of the country into Phthiotis, Pelasgiotis, and Hestiaeotis, is, it is true, anterior to the Macedonian times³⁶, but unconnected with the question of political dissolution. Amongst the inhabitants of the mountains around Thessaly several races, such as the Perrhæbians, Magnetes, and the Phthiotan Achæans, were tributary to the Thessalians³⁷.

In the island of CRETE, whose local character promoted political disunion, the states of Gnossus and Gortys, as the heads of the island, were at variance, and opposed to each other with an equal balance of power; Cydonia usually determined between them³⁸. Lyctus, which was no less Doric than they were, seldom appears to have taken any part in their disputes.

The Spartans and Eleans not only raised themselves to hegemony over the older inhabitants of their districts, but degraded them to the condition of Perioeci. Argos struggled for the hegemony in its own province without complete or permanent success; and its endeavours to establish an Amphictyony under the presidency of Apollo Pythæus³⁹ were also abortive; it was the power of Phidon alone which united the whole of Argolis; but after Sparta obtained the ascendant, those states ceased

³⁵ Thucyd. 2. 22.

³⁶ Aristot. ap. Phot. *τετραρχία* (comp. Etym. M. *τετρ.*) states that Aleuas the son of Pyrrhus made the division.

³⁷ Thucyd. 2. 101; 4. 78; 8. 3; Xen. Hell. 6. 1. 7. According to Theophr. ap. Ath. 6. 265. C. part of the Perrhæbians and Magnesians were reduced to bondage; but that these as Penestæ were not identical with those tributary nations is proved by Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 3.

³⁸ Strab. 10. 478. It would probably be difficult to prove a hegemony of the Lyctians, (Göttling. Aristotel. Pol. 475.)

³⁹ Müller, Dor. 1. 85. 153.

to be dependent. Sicyon, Phlius, and the towns of the Acté, Epidaurus, Trœzen, Hermione, and Halieis, undoubtedly asserted their independence before the time of the Persian wars⁴⁰; and even that old stronghold of the Atridæ, Mycenæ, once more arose, and struggled for the presidency at the panegyris of Nemea⁴¹.

The subjugation of adjacent states was partly confined to the descendants of a common race, as the authority of Naxos over the Cyclades⁴²; that of Eretria over Andros, Tenos, Ceos⁴³, and the maritime supremacy of Polycrates⁴⁴, which was intended to find a prop and support in the sanctuary of Delos⁴⁵. But in Sicily the tyrants Hippocrates of Gela, and Gelon of Syracuse⁴⁶, asserted their strength with all the marks of undisguised aggression; and at the beginning of the Persian wars, Syracuse under Gelon, and Agrigentum under Theron, possessed the hegemony over the whole of Grecian Sicily. The earliest example⁴⁷ of a struggle for hegemony over the descendants of a common race in a wider extent was offered by Phidon of Argos; what he retained for a short time only, afterwards dissolved to Sparta, which, since the reduction of Messenia, had assumed a very commanding attitude, and supported her position both by force of arms and mythical claims, such as the assertion that the sons of the Messenian king Æpy-

⁴⁰ After the invasion of Cleomenes, Argos imposed a mulct upon the Æginetans who did not pay; Sicyon was to pay 100 talents—were they discharged or not? Herod. 6. 92.

⁴¹ Diod. 11. 65.

⁴² Diod. 5. 50.

⁴³ Strab. 10. 448.

⁴⁴ Herod. 3. 39, sqq.; Thuc. 3. 104.

⁴⁵ Thuc. 1. 13; comp. Phot. *Πύθια*.

⁴⁶ Herod. 7. 153, sqq.

⁴⁷ Strab. 8. 358; Paus. 6. 22. 2. Concerning his attempt on Corinth, see Plut. *Amator*. 9. 93—95. Compare at large Müller, *Æginet.* 51—63.

tus had made over Messenia to Sparta, where they had taken refuge⁴⁸. She appears as the chief in war, issuing military proclamations, and as the supreme arbitress of the judicial concerns of the Peloponnesus, and was occasionally chosen beyond its limits to act in the capacity of umpire, as in the dispute between Athens and Megara about Salamis⁴⁹, and was invested with the chief command in the Persian war⁵⁰. However, she did not at this stage, as afterwards, introduce into the dependent states a constitution suited to her own purposes; her marked opposition to democracy was not yet fully developed.

Claims on the part of the mother states to hegemony were, as before observed⁵¹, sometimes asserted without any reasonable foundation whatever; as, for instance, when a mother state in other respects evinced no marks of maternal care or interest for the colony, or the founders of the latter had seceded from the parent state in a spirit of hostility, they were better founded when a colony was established with a view to obtain habitations for the surplus citizens, or to form a staple for the mother city; in both cases it was necessary that they should have since continued devoted and obedient to the parent state. No certain principle had as yet been laid down for the settlement of the individual services incident to this condition⁵²; a parent state bent upon asserting a hege-

⁴⁸ Isocrat. Archid. 180. 184. Comp. on the abstraction of the Palladium from Argos, Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 206.

⁴⁹ Plut. Sol. 10.

⁵⁰ Herod. 8. 2; compare on the subject of Sparta's hegemony generally, Müller, Dor. 1. 178, sqq.

⁵¹ See § 21, ad finem.

⁵² What is cited in Harpocr. ἀπουκία, must, without doubt, be referred to the time when Athens had the sovereignty of the seas.

mony endeavoured, as much as possible, to render its pretensions paramount to the above described honorary dependence of filial piety, and when its claims were disregarded, appealed to the general law of hegemony⁵³; Corinth in particular exerted herself to raise this claim to a sort of universal political law⁵⁴. They were occasionally asserted with effect; Sinope kept its colonies Trapezus, Cerasus, Cotyora⁵⁵, in a tributary condition; interference with the internal concerns of her settlements, and even oppression, were exercised by Corinth; she sent Epidemiurgi as magistrates to Potidæa⁵⁶, and demanded a share in the booty and conquests of the colonies⁵⁷; Megara was compelled to send envoys in mourning to the obsequies of a Bacchiad⁵⁸; Ægina, finally, had in former times sent all causes to be tried in the courts of its parent city Epidaurus⁵⁹. However, all this depended upon circumstances; that which was called political law alone afforded no security, unless accompanied by energetic despotism, by which means alone, for example, Periander for a time held the refractory Corcyra in check⁶⁰. The colonies were very willing to conciliate the kindness and friendship of the parent city, and testified their grateful obedience by various acts of pious duty. In those cases where the succour of the mother city was

⁵³ Thuc. 1. 38.: ἐπὶ τῷ ἡγεμόνεσσι τε εἶναι καὶ τὰ εἰκότα θαυμάζεσθαι; as well as 1. 25, δίκαιον, 3. 61. κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.

⁵⁴ Thuc. 1. 25 αἱ ἄλλαι ἀποικίαι, must, from 1. 38. αἱ γοῦν ἄλλαι ἀποικίαι τιμῶσιν ἡμᾶς, be limited to Corinthian colonies. Compare on the Corinth. Raoul-Roch. 3. 384.

⁵⁵ Xenoph. Anab. 5. 5. 10.

⁵⁶ Thuc. 1. 56.

⁵⁷ Paus. 5. 22. 3.

⁵⁸ Schol. Pind. Nem. 7. 58; Schol. Aristoph. Ran. 439 (447); Bekker. Anecd. 281. Μεγαρέων δάκρυα. Comp. Zenob. 5. 8.

⁵⁹ Herod. 5. 83.

⁶⁰ Herod. 3. 52.

permanently necessary to them, they connected themselves with it closely, and were perfectly willing to perform military service in its ranks; thus, from the fear of Corcyra, Leucas, Ambracia, and Anactorium attached themselves to Corinth⁶¹, and chose her for umpire in their disputes⁶²; but again, when the increase of their own power inspired them with confidence, they became jealous of the imperious pretensions of the parent city⁶³, and did not hesitate to sever the tie that connected them, and to offer resistance to its encroachments.

III. THE STANDARD OF MUTUAL RECOGNITION, AND OF THE PROCEEDINGS CONNECTED WITH IT.

a. Character of the Individual Grecian States in their political intercourse with each other.

§ 27. No fixed principle had been established to determine the validity of a union as a state, and mutual recognition, or the guarantee of independence. According to the spirit of the Grecian citizenship, the distinctive feature of the independence of a state was the right of ordering its own affairs, and this probably determined the estimation in which the states mutually held each other. At the same time, since the decline of the heroic-princely authority, it was almost a matter of indifference in their mutual intercourse, what species of supreme power regulated the internal

⁶¹ Thuc. 1. 27, 30; 2. 80.

⁶² Corinth and Corcyra effected an adjustment between Syracuse and the Rhodian Gela. Herod. 7. 154.

⁶³ The words of the Corcyraeans in Thucyd. 1. 34, are: *πᾶσα ἀποικία εὐ μὲν πάσχουσα τιμᾷ τὴν μητρόπολιν, ἀδικουμένη δὲ ἀλλοτριούται· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ δούλοι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ ὅμοιοι τοῖς λειπομένοις εἶναι ἐκπέπονται.*

concerns of another state; Sparta alone, it is said, would not acknowledge the tyranny in the Peloponnesus, a statement which will be examined more minutely below. Therefore when the management of public affairs was vested in its own authorities, and was not subject to the interference of any other state, federal or colonial relations were not considered as affecting its character of independence. The above-described disposition in the states thus situated, to make use of such relations for their advantage, and not for their restraint, accorded with the political intercourse carried on with the member of a confederacy or with a colony; of a tendency in several confederate or parent states in conjunction to strive for a recognition of their joint capacity or authority in every individual state belonging to them, there is not the slightest vestige, any more than of a disposition based upon the principles of international law, to take such into consideration in their intercourse with single states. But as soon as a more rigorous hegemony had been added to those relations, this independence was in many respects cast into the shade. However, it was not considered as endangered by all kinds of external dependence; the Grecian states did not hesitate to become tributary to their more powerful, and even to barbarian neighbours, if by this means they might enjoy unlimited authority over their domestic concerns—as the Ionians did to the Lydians¹. A most striking exemplification of this relation is the full recognition of the Perrhæbians, Magnesians, and

¹ Herod. 1. 27.

Phthiotan Achæans as members of the Amphictyonic Council, although they were tributary to the Thes-salians ².

The political proceedings of the independent states, in their relations with each other, were principally directed to the preservation of mutual peace, the depredations of individuals excepted; and upon any violation of the same it was stipulated that amicable negotiations should be first resorted to (*δίκας δοῦναι καὶ δέχεσθαι*), instead of immediately having recourse to arms. Hence the universally recognised mission ³, and inviolability of heralds, the disposition under particular circumstances to give satisfaction by the extradition of criminals; as, for example, when Sparta offered to surrender king Leotychides to Ægina ⁴; and lastly, instead of a general conflict, to regard the combat of two or more representatives of the contending states as decisive ⁵. The disposition, however, in time of war to acknowledge in the individual enemy the ally of a state, is attested by the practice of restoring prisoners of war in consideration of a ransom ⁶. Peace was effected by the arbitration of a third state ⁷; but no notion seems to have been entertained of a guarantee for its observance. Notwithstanding the principles of international law thus began to regulate their intercourse, it is apparent, from the already described nature of the hegemony, that the mutual recognition of inde-

² See § 24. n. 23; and § 26. n. 37.

³ For an example of a πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος of the Æginetans against Athens, consult Herod. 5. 81.

⁴ Herod. 6. 85.

⁵ Concerning the battle of the six hundred for Thyrea, see Herod. 1. 182; comp. Thucyd. 5. 41.

⁶ Herod. 5. 77, διμνέως.

⁷ Sparta between Athens and Megara, Plut. Sol. 10. Periander between Mitylene and Athens, Herod. 5. 95.

pendence was by no means so firmly guaranteed as not to be occasionally endangered by lawless violence; no common interest of the Grecian states collectively afforded a security to one of them individually; no alliance ensured effectual assistance and protection. No obstacle being therefore opposed to it by any general bond of union, force was accordingly employed, as soon as a state desirous of acquiring power was in a condition to assert it; the Messenians were reduced to slavery by Sparta, and Crissa and Sybaris razed to the ground by their conquerors. The oath of the Amphictyons, which rigorously prohibited the destruction of a confederate city, and their practice, were wholly at variance with each other⁸.

In considering the Grecian states singly, Sparta appears, during the age before the Persian war, to have exercised the greatest sway over her neighbours, and indirectly upon Greece in general. Her cupidity knew no bounds, and whilst she was desirous of engrossing every thing, she imparted nothing in return; although tenacious of granting a reciprocity of intercourse, she did not scruple to interfere in the proceedings of other states in the most despotic manner. Her inhospitality to strangers, and prohibition of the residence of her citizens in foreign countries⁹, are evidences of a desire to prevent the native virtue from becoming impaired, but, at the same time, to deprive others of the advantages which might result from it. With all her simplicity of faith and life, she seldom evinced towards other countries an open and inge-

⁸ — μηδεμίαν πόλιν τῶν Ἀμφικτυονίδων ἀνάστατον ποιήσειν. Æsch. de falsa Legat. 284.

⁹ Plut. Lyc. 27.

nuous disposition; mystery¹⁰ and the perversion of truth are not unfrequently allied¹¹. Thus the rest of the Greeks were only acquainted with her rough and repulsive character; the adjacent inhabitants very soon felt the effects of her contentious spirit, with which the first Proclid Sous very early combined stratagem¹². Messenia, which is represented to us as repulsing aggression and displaying the noblest patriotism, experienced, on the subjugation of the Achæans of Amyclæ, Helos, etc., the effects of her practised and pampered thirst of power and conquest¹³, which is embodied in the tradition of the oath, not to return home before the reduction of Messenia¹⁴. The zenith of Spartan ambition is exhibited in the reckless disposition of Cleomenes, which found fertile materials in the political character of his people, and in his attack on Argos and Ægina¹⁵; his march to Athens, his favour towards Isagoras¹⁶, and the preparations set on foot by Sparta, after the retirement of Cleomenes, to bring Athens, which had shaken off the yoke of the Pisistratidæ, once more under their tyranny¹⁷, are materials enough to explain the reputed enmity that Sparta bore to tyrants, which appears to have been grounded on indiscriminating panegyric¹⁸, as

¹⁰ Thucyd. 5. 74.

¹¹ Hence Herod. 9. 54. τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων φρονήματα ὡς ἄλλα φρονοῦντων καὶ ἄλλα λεγόντων, comp. Eurip. Androm. 446, sqq. Did the injunction to the Platæans to ally themselves with the Athenians proceed from a mischievous policy? See Herod. 6. 108; Thucyd. 3. 68, and on the other side of the question, Plut. de Herod. Malignitate, 9. 419.

¹² Plut. Lyc. 2.

¹³ Polyb. 6. 48, calls the Spartans φιλαρχώτατοι, and 49, with reference to Messenia, πλεονεκτικώτατοι.

¹⁴ Paus. 4. 5. 3.

¹⁵ Herod. 6. 76, sqq.; 6. 49, sqq.

¹⁶ Ibid. 5. 70, sqq.

¹⁷ Ibid. 5. 91. 93.

¹⁸ Thucyd. 1. 18; 6. 53; Plut. de Herod. Malign. 9. 411. The testimony of Thucydides is less valuable, in consequence of his disposition to generalize. Little reliance can be placed upon Plutarch's list of tyrants, said to have been expelled by Sparta, comp. § 52, init.

well as to make us suspect the influence of particular motives in those undertakings, which have been adduced as examples of a political opposition to tyrants, as in the expedition against Polycrates, for instance, gratitude for the assistance of the Samians in the Messenian wars ¹⁹.

Argos was, in her thirst of power, but little inferior to Sparta ²⁰; she is the transcript of Agamemnon, full of arrogant pretension, and yet her citizens were neither the best nor the bravest of Greece. She had inherited the Hegemony of Agamemnon, and during several centuries, exhibited great activity in asserting her pretensions in Argolis ²¹, and especially against Sparta, whose growing power bid fair to outstrip her own; Phidon extended the pre-eminence of Argos over the whole of Argolis, Ægina, and even over the Peloponnesus ²². But he had overshot the mark; his ascendancy yielded to that of Sparta and Elis; in the LVIII. Olympiad, two hundred years after he had celebrated the Olympic festival as Hegemon (Ol. VIII.), Argos was deprived of the frontier-land, Cynuria, by Sparta ²³, and soon afterwards was entirely reduced by Cleomenes ²⁴; from that time the above-named towns in the vicinity of Argos remained faithful to Sparta. In Sicyon, the tyrant Clisthenes had carried to an extreme the principle of opposition to Argos ²⁵; amicable relations be-

¹⁹ Herod. 3. 47.

²⁰ Herod. 3. 148; 7. 148. 149.

²¹ Comp. § 26, n. 39, sqq.

²² § 26, n. 47.

²³ According to Herod. 1. 82, the whole of the eastern coast of Laconia, as far as Malea and Cythera, once belonged to Argos. It appears to me that this should be referred to the heroic age, when Laconia was dependent upon Mycenæ; from the very commencement of the age after the Doric migration, Cynuria seems to have been the confine of Argos.

²⁴ Herod. 6. 78, sqq.

²⁵ Herod. 5. 67.

tween the two states were not re-established till the latter ages of Grecian history. Ægina, since the destruction of Phidon's power, had exhibited equal hostility to the parent city, Epidaurus²⁶, and to the Hegemony of Argos²⁷, and a fearless reliance on its own powers against Sparta and Athens; on friendly terms with Thebes, it carried on a nicely-balanced contest with Athens, till the naval power of that state was called into existence by Themistocles²⁸. In Arcadia, the Tegeans, during centuries, supported heroic conflicts with Sparta²⁹, till the latter offered them her friendship, and assigned them the post of honour in the left wing of the confederate army³⁰. The Orchomenians were attached to the Messenians, but the king, Aristocrates, acted treacherously towards the confederates³¹; Mantinea adhered to Argos, but all the Arcadians unanimously responded to the warlike summons of Sparta³²; Elis was, in consequence of its contests with the Pisatans and Triphylians, in want of a point of support, and found it in Sparta. The Achæans did not maintain a very intimate connection with the Peloponnesians; against Sparta they harboured hereditary hatred³³, but their inactivity in the Persian war is no evidence of friendship towards Agos, whose character corresponded with their own. Corinth, as a commercial state, preferred conciliating all parties, and limited all active interference to her own colonies; however, her tyrants, Cypselus and Periander,

²⁶ Ibid. 5. 83.²⁷ Ibid. 6. 92.²⁸ Plut. Them. 5.²⁹ Herod. 1. 66; 6. 61; Paus. 3. 3. 5; 3. 7. 3; 8. 5. 6; 47. 2; 48. 3; 54. 3; Polyæn. 1. 8.³⁰ Compare § 26, n. 13.³¹ Paus. 4. 17. 2.³² Herod. 6. 74.³³ Paus. 7. 6. 3. Pellene alone was afterwards in favour of Sparta.

evinced a more enlarged and comprehensive policy. During the succeeding period, Corinth adhered to Sparta, but the Corinthian Sosicles rose against the efforts of that state to restore the tyranny in Athens ³⁴, and the Corinthians, collectively considered, were in favour of the Athenians. With short-sighted mercantile calculation, she, in consideration of a sum of money, sent them ships to be employed against Ægina ³⁵. Her colonies, Megara and Corcyra, behaved with as much insolence in their intercourse with every other state, as they exhibited towards their mother city. The Bœotians remained entirely insulated, till the pre-eminence of Thebes became firmly established. At this time Pisistratus received succours from Thebes, for the purpose of effecting his return to Athens ³⁶. When the latter had become free, there arose in Thebes considerable jealousy, and a desire to enter the lists with her; the retirement of Plataea from her Hegemony increased that hostility, which could never afterwards be entirely extinguished. The Phocians only exhibit the most inveterate hatred against the Thessalians ³⁷; the sentiments of the Locrians of Amphissa towards them ³⁸ were similar, and the Ætolians and Acarnanians were, by a like border-hatred, kept in a state of separation ³⁹. The Thessalians are distinguished by an unbounded spirit of conquest, by hostility to Phocis ⁴⁰, and impetuous opposition to Crissa ⁴¹ in particular; they were, moreover, confederates of the Athenian tyrants ⁴², and, in general, most desirous

³⁴ Herod. 5. 92.

³⁶ Herod. 1. 61.

³⁸ Thucyd. 3. 101.

⁴¹ Compare § 24.

³⁵ Herod. 6. 89; Thucyd. 1. 41.

³⁷ Ibid. 8. 30.

³⁹ Strab. 10. 458.

⁴² Herod. 5. 63,

⁴⁰ Herod. 7. 176; 8. 27.

to obtrude themselves within the boundaries of purely Grecian life⁴³. The Athenians, for nearly five centuries confined within their own limits, were, for the first time, seen to pass them in the Crissæan war; the almost simultaneous attempt of Cylon on the tyranny, which was supported by his father-in-law, Theagenes of Megara⁴⁴, excited a feeling against the latter place, and Salamis, which had probably, till that time, been Magarian, was conquered⁴⁵. The views of Pisis-tratus were more extensive; he himself conquered Naxos and Sigeum⁴⁶; and Miltiades subdued the Chersonese⁴⁷. Nevertheless, after the expulsion of the tyrants, Athens was obliged to be roused, almost by force and opprobrious attacks, to make head against her hostile neighbours, Thebes, Ægina, and Chalcis⁴⁸. The victory she obtained over them is like a fountain from which she derived the inspiring consciousness of her own strength. Jealousy of the rich fund of traditional lore possessed by Thebes, embellished the *mythi* relating to Theseus as the illustrious hero who had achieved the pacification of Greece. Towards Sparta and Corinth, Athens entertained respect and friendship, but the pride of Autochthony⁴⁹ began to display it-

⁴³ They occur in Eubœa as the allies of Chalcis, Plut. Amator. Narr. 9. 48. On the defeat they suffered near Ceressus in Bœotia, see Paus. 9. 14. 1; Plut. Camill. 19; de Herod. Malign. 9. 439.

⁴⁴ Thucyd. 1. 126.

⁴⁵ From the confused accounts on the subject, we may, however, gather that Solon and Pisistratus were the instigators of the war, see Plut. Sol. 3. 9; Comp. Sol. et Poplic. p. 434; Æl. V. H. 7. 19; Polyæn. 1. 20; Arn. Poliœr. 4; Justin. 2. 8; Diog. Laert. 1. 46; Strab. 9. 394; Paus. 1. 40. 4; Frontin. Stratag. 4. 44.

⁴⁶ Herod. 5. 70. 94.

⁴⁷ Ibid. 6. 34, sqq.

⁴⁸ See § 26, n. 14. Totally unfounded is the assertion of Diodor. 4. 61, that from the time Theseus effected the union of the Attic boroughs, Ἀθηναῖοι διὰ τὸ βάρος τῆς πόλεως φρονήματος ἐνεπίμπλαντο καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἡγεμονίας ὠρέχθησαν.

⁴⁹ Eurip. Fragm. ap. Lycurg. adv. Leocr. 204; Lysias Orat. Fun. 76; Isocrat. Panegy. § 4, etc.

self, and that arrogance, which enriched the common-places of the orators concerning the primeval Athenian hospitality, was afterwards directed against the inhospitality of Sparta. In Eubœa, Eretria was upon as intimate a footing with the Athenians as Chalcis was with the Thebans; both of them interfered in the disputes of the adjacent states; their connection with the Ionians in Asia was of various kinds⁵⁰; antiquity is silent on the subject of their sentiments towards their Thracian colonies. Amongst the Cyclades, Naxos for a short period struggled for precedence⁵¹. After its subjugation to Athenian supremacy, and the subsequent reduction of Paros, this beautiful cluster of islands sunk for ever into a state devoid of all political strength and character. The Ionians in Asia kept up a very active intercourse; this was, however, combined with the proneness to feuds, selfishness, and a disposition to contract ties with the barbarians, even at the price of the common welfare of Greece; the Ionians and Carians for a long time carried on piracy in conjunction⁵². The Dorians there appear peaceful; Crete, occupied with internal feuds⁵³, sent out mercenaries to Greece, although there was no strictly political intercourse between the countries. The Æolian Cuma was regardless of the quarrels of its neighbours⁵⁴. On the other hand, the chief cities of Lesbos were not afraid of carrying on a war with Pisistratus⁵⁵. The colonial bonds between the states situate on the northern

⁵⁰ Herod. 5. 99; Thucyd. 1. 15.

⁵¹ Diodor. 5. 50.

⁵² Herod. 2. 152.

⁵³ Polyb. 6. 46. Concerning the pacificator, Charmides, see Paus. 3. 2. 7. The well-known *Συγκρητισμός*, in time of danger, must probably be referred to the Roman times, see Etym. M. *συγκρητίσαι*.

⁵⁴ Ephor. ap. Strab. 13. 623.

⁵⁵ Herod. 5. 94.

seas and the mother cities, was a very slight one; nothing is known on the subject of their sentiments towards each other; and the Thracian cities are involved in no less obscurity. On the other hand, in the west, Sybaris proves itself to have been so overbearing, as to treat the towns of the vicinity with indignity, and assert a haughty authority over the maternal continent ⁵⁶. Crotona, to which nobler sentiments are ascribed, resisted its encroachments. This city was opposed by Locri and Rhegium ⁵⁷, which were not partakers of the corruption of Sybaris; Tarentum, the most powerful of those states, does not display a vestige of the domineering spirit and arrogance which characterized its parent city, Sparta. It seems, however, for a long period, to have made a stand singly against the neighbouring barbarians. In Sicily, political intercourse was almost exclusively confined to the tyrants individually; it is not till after the Persian wars that the mass of the people in the states assumes a bolder and a more decided character. Massilia, entirely unconnected with Greece, exhibited neither attachment nor aversion to its kindred race and those sprung from it, except, perhaps, in sending presents to Delphi ⁵⁸. How the political character of the states in the management of their external relations adapted itself to their particular form of government, will be more advantageously stated in succeeding portions of the present work; in general, it may be regarded as certain, that the tyrants showed the greatest solicitude to contract external ties ⁵⁹, and were most vigorous in asserting Hegemony.

⁵⁶ § 21. n. 28.⁵⁷ The battle of Sagra, Heyne, Opusc. 2. 184.⁵⁸ Paus. 10. 8. 4; 18. 6.⁵⁹ Diod. 14. 93.

*b. Political Relation of the Greeks to the
Barbarians.*

§ 28. The character which was common to the Greeks in general, and the physical features of the habitations of the people, were but little adapted to produce a radical difference between them and the barbarians, or to cause a broad political line of distinction to be drawn between them. First of all, the half-Greek neighbours of the continent, in Macedonia and Epirus, prevented the Greeks in their own country from arriving at the distinct consciousness of their own nationality; the same observation applies to those nations on the west coast of Asia, the Carians, Leleges, Pelasgi, and Troades; and perhaps it is not to these inhabitants of Asia alone that we must apply the assertion of Thucydides, that the old Grecian institutions had many points of resemblance with those of barbarians¹. Homer gives no clue to discover how far self-knowledge advanced with the progress of Grecian life in Ionia; but the various migrations and settlements amongst barbarians of all descriptions, who had nothing in common with the Greeks, such as Scythians, Sauromatians, Paphlagonians, Thracians, Illyrians, Japygians, Sicilians, and Opicans, must necessarily have given a gradual but decided impulse to self-knowledge, and to a distinction between themselves and those nations in the first instance, and in process of time, even such as were less strongly marked with the barbarian impress, which, even before the Persian wars, doubtless led to a definite notion upon the subject amongst the nation generally. How-

¹ Thucyd. 1. 6.

ever, this can hardly have turned upon a difference of race; the word barbarian was at first only employed to designate as un-Grecian harshness of language²; but together with more exact information respecting the intrinsic peculiarities of foreign nations, which might have led them to observe the difference of extraction, commenced the genealogical tissue of Grecian fable, which represented all other nations as proceeding from the Greeks, and whatever came to their knowledge they stamped with the mythic-genealogical impress. This, then, is the foundation for a criticism of the history of the Grecian colonies of the heroic age. Similarity of name and affinity of sound were perverted in the most wanton manner; the Medes were derived from Medea, the Persians from Perseus³, nay, even Pontic cannibals, the Achæans⁴, traced to the Greeks of the same name. But they testified sincere respect for those who were at an early period, in many particulars, more civilised than themselves, viz., the Phœnicians, Lydians, and Egyptians⁵. It is certain that before Pherecydes there existed a tradition, that strangers had come from those countries into Greece, and great care was taken to expatiate on, and set forth the services they had rendered her; at the same time, the marvellous tales related by emigrants and mariners, stimulated curiosity to behold the birthplaces of those reputed fathers of Grecian culture; Greek sages and others traversed Egypt and Asia, and gazed with astonishment on

² Strab. 14. 662; comp. Roth über das. Wort. Barbar. p. 3, n.

³ Herod. 7. 61. 62; Hygin. 26; Buttmann über die mythische Verbind. p. 232.

⁴ Appian. Mithrid. 102.

⁵ To this applies Paus. 9. 36. 3: "Ἕλληνες δὲ ἄρα εἰσὶ δεινοὶ τὰ ὑπερόρια ἐν θαύματι τίθεσθαι μείζονι ἢ τὰ οἰκεία.

the venerable monuments of hoar antiquity, and the solid and imperishable forms in which the political institutions of those regions were cast. This led to the mythical exaltation of the unknown north; Homer's mention of the Hippomolgi⁶, etc., was added to the legends of Abaris⁷, and Zamolxis⁸, and even Magi⁹ and Assyrians¹⁰ were drawn into the mystic circle of the barbaric philosophy.

In a consideration of the political intercourse, properly so called, the separate barbarian tribes, which the Greeks met with in their external settlements, must be distinguished from those already named, and in general from such as made head against the Greeks with the unity and power of states already arrived at political maturity. Against these, such as the Carians in Miletus¹¹, force was occasionally employed; but the Greeks for the most part seem, in the manner of the modern Europeans, to have obtained, by means of an alluring bait, a spot of sufficient extent for their settlements. When therefore the Locrians are said to have sworn friendship to the Sicilians¹² as long as they should stand upon that ground and bear heads upon their shoulders, at the same time having mould concealed in their shoes and garlic-tops on their shoulders; this does not precisely imply that it was unnecessary to keep faith with barbarians; for the Greeks themselves made use of similar artifices towards each other¹³. The Grecian co-

⁶ Comp. § 10. n. 46.

⁷ Herod. 4. 36; Suidas Ἀβάρ, etc.

⁸ Herod. 4. 94.

⁹ Suid. Πυθαγόρας.

¹⁰ Suid. Δάμυς.

¹¹ Herod. 1. 147.

¹² Polyb. 12. 6; Polyæn. 6. 22; Zenob. 5. 4; 4. 97; comp. Polyæn. 6. 53. on Agnon. of Strymon.

¹³ Strab. 6. 265.

lonies sought by every means in their power to preserve peace with the conterminous barbarians, even though it required to be purchased by a tribute, as was the case on the Cimmerian Bosphorus¹⁴; but in their commercial intercourse they took measures to prevent their admission: hence the frontier markets Epidamnus¹⁵ and Halicarnassus¹⁶. Amongst the nations of more importance in a political point of view, the Phœnicians appear intentionally to have made way for the Greeks, till the command of Persia forced them into a war with them. On the other hand, we read of no attempts on the part of the Greeks to throw obstacles in the way of the maritime expeditions or settlements of the Phœnicians; but the enterprising character of the former, and the active nature of their sea-trade, must necessarily have led to a repugnance to admit Phœnicians into the Grecian seas. The Greeks were at an early period on friendly terms with the Egyptians. Although the accounts of the intercourse between the continent and Psammetichus and Psammes¹⁷, may seem entitled to little credit, this is counterbalanced by the decidedly historical authority for the traffic carried on between the Æginetans, the Asiatic Dorians, Ionians, and Æolians, and Egypt. This attained maturity by means of settlements made by the Greeks in Egypt¹⁸, singly and in bodies. The connection between Amasis and Cyprus, which he had subdued¹⁹, did not prevent Delphi from acknowledging him as a friend²⁰.

¹⁴ Strab. 7. 310, 311.¹⁵ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 191.¹⁶ Vitruv. 2. 8.¹⁷ Herod. 2. 160; Diodor. 1. 67.¹⁸ Herod. 2. 152. 178; Strab. 17. 801.¹⁹ Herod. 2. 182.²⁰ Ib. 2. 180.

The relations of hospitality between Polycrates and that place²¹ were of a personal character. The Lydians did not emerge from obscurity till the time of Gyges; the Ionian and Æolian towns²² which were attacked by their kings, at first resisted, but with the growing ascendant of the Lydians they neither continued to place any confidence in their strength individually, nor entered into an armed alliance. Miletus established friendly relations with Alyattes by means of a treaty of hospitality²³. All seem to have paid tribute to Crœsus²⁴. "The benignant excellence of Crœsus²⁵," his predilection for the manners and arts of Greece, his hospitable court, and his magnificent donations, assembled around him the most illustrious of the Greeks²⁶; the tributary towns yielded him ready obedience; Delphi conferred upon him citizenship and honourable rank²⁷; and Sparta entered into an alliance with him²⁸. Courage and military feeling were at first aroused against the Persians; but upon that occasion too the Grecian policy lacked steadfastness and solidity, and prudent counsel was unheeded; the proposal of Bias to sail to Cynos, and that of Thales to establish a general council²⁹, were rejected: Harpagus reduced the towns singly: Miletus, according to ancient custom, had in good time concluded a separate treaty with the approaching conqueror³⁰; the rest, although falling under the power of tyrants, strove to obtain a promise that no barbarians should come within their

²¹ Herod. 3. 39, sqq.

²² Ib. 1. 15—26.

²³ Ib. 1. 22.

²⁴ Ib. 1. 16, 27.

²⁵ Κροίσου φιλόφρων ἀρετά, Pind. Pyth. 1. 184.

²⁶ Herod. 1. 30.; 6. 36. 125.

²⁷ See § 22. n. 68.

²⁸ Herod. 1. 69. 70. 81. 83; Diod. Frag. V. 48. Bipont.; Paus. 4. 5. 1.

²⁹ Herod. 1. 170.

³⁰ Ib. 1. 152, 153.

walls, and this was given to them by the victors³¹. On the mainland they were still deficient in just views to enable them to estimate the power of Persia; Sparta's threats against Cyrus³² provoked laughter; Athens' embassy to Artaphernes, the satrap of Sardis, to obtain assistance against Cleomenes³³, is an evidence that till then no formal distinction had been drawn between them and the barbarians; but it is very probable that the insolence of the Persian prince, who first exacted homage by the presentation of earth and water, effected a considerable change in the sentiments of the Athenians. Nevertheless they were afterwards mean enough to send to him once more³⁴, for assistance against Hippias; the commencement of the antibarbarian principle dates from their participation in the Ionic insurrection. The Etruscans, if we except their probably friendly intercourse with Massilia, seem to have been upon a decidedly hostile footing with their Grecian neighbours; which however by no means operated as an impediment to Agylla's (Cære's) intercourse with Delphi³⁵. The Campanian Cuma must certainly have established treaties with them, otherwise its existence would have been precarious; Syracuse under Hiero was the first amongst the remaining Grecian states to maintain its ground against the Etruscans. The Carthaginians first encountered the Phocæans; the sea-fight with the latter³⁶ was the prelude to a long series of sanguinary battles in

³¹ Ib. 3. 89; Xen. Cyropæd. 7. 4. 4.

³² Herod. 1. 153.

³³ Ib. 5. 73.

³⁴ Ib. 5. 96.

³⁵ Strab. 5. 220.

³⁶ Herod. 1. 163, sqq.

Sicily, in which however the former took no further part. Was there ever any intercourse between the Grecian continent and Carthage? The first bond of alliance with Rome was contracted by the entrance of the Phocæans into the Tiber³⁷, and the next by Aristodemus, tyrant of Cuma³⁸; the latter was dissolved upon the rise of the Roman commonwealth; Rome did not become the object of Grecian politics till two centuries later.

THE CHANGES EFFECTED IN PERSONAL RANK UPON THE TERMINATION OF THE HEROIC AGE.

1. THE PRINCELY OFFICE IN ITS DECLINE.

§ 29. As the dissolution of the ancient alliances of tribes and provinces, and the subdivision into smaller communities, were succeeded by a thorough change in the external relations of the Grecian states, so the migrations and foundation of colonies led to the downfall of the heroic hereditary monarchy, the decay of the ancient political system, and the commencement of a new dispensation of government. The incitement to internal revolutions grew more frequent as the territories of individual states became narrowed, and the general inspection of the political machinery became more practicable. This led to the formation of republics,

³⁷ Justin, 43, 3.

³⁸ Dion. Hal. 7, 2, sqq.

it having been laid down as a necessary condition of that form of government, that it should have a small territory¹.

It is once more necessary to revert to the return of the national army from Troy. From the contrast between those who returned and those who remained behind, the consequences of that expedition diffused around the venom of political disaffection, which so corroded the sinews of the ancient system, that the forcible entrance of a new element could not be prevented. But the principle of destruction was contained in the nature of migration itself, as well that of the Doric and other migratory hordes collected by the force of circumstances or of their own free will. These did not march, as against Troy, under their own hereditary princes², but now formed a military retinue; and every tribe that happened to have preserved its unity of race, became mixed through the accession of adventures; the hordes did not recognise absolute authority in their leaders, nor were they attached to them by any uniform ties of paternal manners, laws, or religion; and lastly, they bore with them to their new seats a multitude of pretensions, and the confident expectation of possessions, in return for the dangers they had encountered. An army of this description constituted a living personal check on the leader. He no longer stood like the princes of heroic antiquity in the midst of a familiar circle, attached to him by the time-honoured customs of

¹ Montesquieu, *Esprit des L.* 8. 16 : Il est de la nature d'une république, qu'elle n'ait qu'un petit territoire. The verbal observation of Carnot to me, with regard to the termination of the French revolution, was : La France est trop grande pour être république.

² Σπράτευμα, Paus. 7. 2. 1. of the Ionians.

their forefathers, and the associations of their native land, where formal stipulations for the definition of legal relations were unknown, and the prince was the sole fountain of political order. Faith, confidence, the union of filial and parental feelings, the closest bonds of political association, were no more; the leaders of the military hordes were by the dangers of the expedition subjected to the ordinary necessities of humanity, and could not dispense with the voluntary services of their comrades in arms; this continued after the foundation of the new states, where relations were unsettled, and existence was precarious. Besides this there arose differences amongst the leaders themselves, which led to the formation of parties and solicitations for favour; and this again involved a reassertion of the principle, that the best and bravest man was entitled to be prince³, whilst it multiplied⁴ attempts to assert the claims of merit to a share in the powers of government. Thus the military nobility, in part even of princely lineage, or through their bravery, services, or possessions, raised to the dignity of an aristocracy, enclosed the monarchy within such narrow bounds, that it lost that power which at one time acted with such energy and effect upon popular life, and the chiefs of the new states, even though royally descended, could not, since the recognition of their comrades was purely voluntary, once more revert to the mythical-heroic germ from

³ Comp. §. 17. n. 25. The Milesians declared upon the occasion of a contention of this kind that he should reign, ὃς Μιλησίους πλείω ἀγαθὰ ἐργάσαιτο. Conon. 44.

⁴ Aristot. Pol. 3. 10. 7: Regal government was established in times of remote antiquity, because those distinguished for excellence were few in number, but upon their growing more numerous, οὐκέτι ὑπέμενον, ἀλλ' ἐζήτουν κοινόν τι καὶ πολιτείαν καθίστασαν. Comp. 4. 10, 11.

which the ancient princely families, in their native provinces, had grown up and flourished so far above the mass of the people. The limitations of the princely power were probably in part stipulated during the preparations for an expedition, and the dangers of the march, by mutual promises and oaths⁵; but many of them bear the marks of having been produced by the violent inroads of the nobility. In Sparta there arose at the commencement of the Heraclidæ, and soon after in Messenia⁶, a mode of royal succession totally distinct from the heroic custom, namely, the joint government of two princes, which, as having the infallible tendency to weaken itself, must be regarded as one of the most effectual limitations of the princely power; the first Messenian prince Cresphontes wished to grant to the former occupants of the country equal privileges with the Dorians, but the latter compelled him to relinquish his purpose⁷; the second prince of Argos, Timenos the son of Ceisus, remained a prince in name only⁸; of a similar import is the statement that the Spartan king Eurypon had waved some of the prerogatives of royalty⁹. Simultaneous with these events, as if spread by the same contagious spirit of the age, was established the responsibility of the prince in Athens¹⁰, which must not indeed, as in the Æolic Cuma¹¹, and, in a later age, the Euthune of the functionaries at Athens, be construed into the formal authorisation of a tribunal to take cognizance of the royal acts, but must be regarded as a sign that the national council

⁵ See Append. ix.

⁷ Strab. 8. 361.

⁹ Plut. Lyc. 2.

¹¹ Plut. Qu. Gr. n. 2.

⁶ Paus. 4. 4. 3.

⁸ Paus. 2. 19. 2.

¹⁰ Paus. 5. 4. 5.

of nobles began to take a more active and influential part in the proceedings of government.

It was impossible for good fruits to result from such a state of things as this ; it possessed within itself the tendency to change and revolution ; the next step was to violence and outrage against the princes. The Messenian nobility slew Cresphontes¹², the Erythræan threw Cnopus into the sea¹³, the Ephesian revolted against the sons of Androcles¹⁴, the Milesian seceded to Myas and thence waged war against the Neleidæ¹⁵. It is, however, far from improbable that in the pernicious law of arms of that age, to which Hesiod¹⁶ incidentally alludes, right was sometimes trampled underfoot by the princes¹⁷ ; they could not nourish paternal sentiments in the emergencies to which they were reduced by the audacity of the turbulent ; and the very existence of their government required that party spirit should direct their proceedings. But the Grecian princes did not find, or they omitted to seek, the support of the lower order, which was the bulwark of the princes in the middle ages, as it must ever be, unless sedition and violence have banished all natural feeling. It is true the participation of the multitude in political movements was occasionally by no means unimportant, and the course they took sometimes decided the event ; however the common man had not yet raised him-

¹² Paus. 4. 3. 4. Comp. Hygin. 184. on Merope.

¹³ Hippias Erythr. ap. Ath. 6. 258. F, sqq.

¹⁴ Ephor. ap. Steph. Byz. Βέννα.

¹⁵ Pólyæn. 8. 35. The tradition recounting the murder of the sons of Amphion by the Theban Sparti, may, with a multitude of others, be referred to the practice of drawing conclusions as to the heroic age from the character of later times ; see Timagoras, ap. Schol. Eurip. Phœniss. 162.

¹⁶ Op. et Di. 190 : — δίκη δ' ἐν χερσὶ καὶ αἰθῶς οὐκ ἔσται.

¹⁷ Σκολιαὶ θέμιστες, Hom. Il. 16. 387.

self to a direct and active share in the struggle for political power, and was not yet distinguished from the nobility by that strict line of demarcation which afterwards paved a way for the tyranny. Therefore the destruction of the princely authority was by no means consummated in the waves of democratic commotion, but in the immediate precinct of the throne. But after the lower order had in process of time worked its way to a higher position in the state, and began to make head against the nobility, by whom its regal stronghold had been invaded, it was too late to re-establish that form of government which had been almost universally abolished, and it could only be revived in its transcript the tyranny. In a few states which were distinguished by tranquillity and order, such as Achaia, the princely dignity terminated in the midst of the people without tumult or subsequent distractions. In others, after the same had ceased to be the highest political authority, we still find an honorary office of the same name, and the word *Basileus* continued to be so favourite a designation amongst the people, that it was willingly transferred to the subsequent tyranny, as if in mitigation and amelioration of the thing itself¹⁸:

Where and how long the princely government subsisted in the single states, can, in consequence of the scanty and unconnected accounts that have reached us, be stated very imperfectly. That at the commencement of the foundation of the new states after the first migrations, its abolition was by no means contemplated; but, on the contrary,

¹⁸ See § 50. n. 22.

that it was still deeply rooted in the spirit of the new age, may be gathered from the fact of its almost universally flourishing in those states. In Sparta, Messenia, and Argos, the government was obtained by the three principal tribes of the Heraclidæ, that of Aristodemus, from which descended Eurysthenes and Procles, Cresphontes, and Temenus¹⁹; from collateral branches sprung Aletes, the first prince of Corinth²⁰, Phalces in Sicyon, who took Lacestades, a native of the country, as co-regent²¹. The possession of princes, said to be descended from the Heraclidæ, some of whom supported their legitimacy on the by no means delicate fiction, that Hercules had, in the course of his wanderings, made kings' daughters pregnant in lawless marriage²², was boasted by almost all the other Doric states²³, such as Rhodes, the race of Tlepolemus²⁴; Cos, the descendants of Thessalus²⁵; and Phæstus, in Crete, which pretended to be built by the Heraclid Phæstus²⁶. Even the princes of Thesaly, the Aleuadæ, endeavoured to establish their affinity with the Heraclidæ²⁷, and their example was emulated by those of Macedonia²⁸. Allied by marriage with the princely house of Sparta was the Ægid Theras, who led the Laconian Ægidæ, and the Minyans to Thera²⁹. Amongst the princely races of old Achæan descent, the posterity of Tisa-

¹⁹ Paus. 4. 3. 3.

²⁰ Paus. 2. 4. 4; Diod. Fragm. v. 4. 13, Bipont.; Etym. M. Ἀλήτης. Comp. Böckh. Pind. expl. 213.

²² Comp. Müller, Dor. 1. 421.

²¹ Paus. 2. 6. 4.

²³ Ibid. 2. 108.

²⁴ Diod. 4. 58; Hom. Il. 2. 653, sqq.

²⁵ Il. 2. 678; Diod. 5. 54.

²⁶ Paus. 2. 6. 3.

²⁷ See Böckh. Pind. expl. 332; comp. Buttmann on the Aleuads in Berlin Abh. Hist. Philol. Cl. 1822. 1823.

²⁸ Thuc. 2. 99; Diod. 17. 4.

²⁹ Herod. 4. 147; Müller, Orchom. 353, sqq.

menus reigned in Achaia³⁰, that of Penthilus in Mitylene³¹ in Lesbos, and very probably in the Æolic Cuma³². Ionic princes, most of whom were Attic Codridæ, and some of the half-blood only, were found in various places: Neleus³³ in Miletus, Androcles³⁴ in Ephesus, Cnopus³⁵ in Erythræ, Æpytus³⁶ in Priene, Cydrelus³⁷ in Myus, Periclus and Abartes³⁸ in Phocæa, Andræmon³⁹ in Lebedus, Apoikos⁴⁰ in Teos, Damasichthon and Promethus⁴¹ in Colophon, Ion of Eubœa⁴² in Chios, and afterwards Egertius⁴³, and the Epidaurian Procles⁴⁴ in Samos.

Add to these, besides those places where tyrants are expressly enumerated, the vague mention made of a king called Pollis in Syracuse⁴⁵, a descendant of the Heraclid Archias⁴⁶, who laid the foundation of that city, as well as of Aristophilides in Tarentum⁴⁷, Damagetus in Ialysus⁴⁸, on the island of Rhodes, and of Lesbian Basileis in the

³⁰ Paus. 7. 6. 2. According to Euseb. Chron. 709. Pantheus and Cometes reigned in Mycenæ after Tisamenus. ³¹ Aristot. Pol. 5. 8. 13.

³² Plut. Qu. Gr. n. 2. Pollax. 9. 83, has a king Agamemnon.

³³ Paus. 7. 2. 1; Polyæn. 16. 12. His son Phrygius, Plut. de Mulier. Virtutib. 7. 37; Polyæn. 8. 35; Parthen. 14; comp. Zenob. 5. 17; comp. Spanheim. ad Callim. Hymn. Dian. 226.

³⁴ Strab. 14. 632; Paus. 7. 2. 5. Etym. M. has Ἑσσην as the Ephesian word for king.

³⁵ Strab. 14. 633; Hippias ap. Ath. 6. 258. F. sqq.; Steph. Byz. Ἐρυθρα. Cleopus is a corrupt reading, Paus. 7. 3. 4.

³⁶ Strab. 14. 633. Ægyptus is corrupt, Paus. 7. 2. 7.

³⁷ Strab. 14. 635. Cyaretus. Paus. 7. 2. 7.

³⁸ Paus. 7. 3. 5. Afterwards Phobus and Blepsus are there, Plut. de Mulier. Virtutib. 7. 41. sqq.

³⁹ Paus. 7. 3. 2. Androcopus, Strab. 14. 633.

⁴⁰ Paus. 7. 3. 3; Strab. ubi sup. Damastes and Neoclus were afterwards there.

⁴¹ Paus. 7. 3. 1. Strab. 14. 633, has Andræmon of Mimnermus.

⁴² Paus. 7. 4. 6.

⁴³ Strab. ubi sup.; Plut. de Mulier. Virtut. mentions a Hippocles.

⁴⁴ Strab. ubi sup.

⁴⁵ Pollux, 6. 16. from Aristot. Ath. 1. 3. B.; Æl. V. H. 12. 31; Etym.

M. Βίβλιος οἶνος. ⁴⁶ Böckh. Pind. Expl. 153.

⁴⁷ Herod. 3. 13. ⁴⁸ Paus. 4. 24. 1.

legislation of Pittacus⁴⁹. Here we are, in all probability, to understand nothing more than a superior magistrate, who is thus vaguely designated in conformity to the predilection for the use of the word *Basileus*, before alluded to, but under which seems to have been concealed a more definite title, such as perhaps *Prytanis* in Syracuse, *Ialysus*, and on the island of Lesbos. We find it as the peculiar designation of an office of state, divested of royal authority indeed, but still associated with distinguished honour, and generally with the administration of a priesthood in Delphi⁵⁰ and Siphnus⁵¹; and it was retained till a late age in Megara⁵², Chalcedon⁵³, Cyzicus⁵⁴, and Samothrace⁵⁵, as the appellation of a functionary below the prince of the country, a sort of governor in Laconia⁵⁶, and this, in the true spirit of antiquity, was derived from that age when *Basileus* was the only designation for a head or chief.

Though these particulars concerning the kingly office during its existence are incomplete, and in part uncertain, the accounts of its decline in single states are still more unsatisfactory. Those which are extant relate, for the most part, to such states as had retained the old heroic monarchy. In Crete the kingly office and unity of state disappear together, immediately after the death of *Idome-neus*⁵⁷; *Etearchus* of Axos⁵⁸, recorded as a king in Crete, when Cyrene was founded, was apparently

⁴⁹ Stob. 42. 280, Orl. ed.⁵⁰ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 177.⁵¹ Isocrat. adv. Callim. 685; comp. Müller, *Æginet.* 155.⁵² Chandler, *Marm. Ox.* 2. 82.⁵³ Count Caylus *recueil*, 2. 55.⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 2. 71. 72. Compare, on the last-mentioned towns, Tittmann, *gr. Staatsv.*⁵⁵ Liv. 45. 5.⁵⁶ Ephor. ap Strab. 8. 364.⁵⁷ Schol. Hom. Od. 19. 186.⁵⁸ Herod. 4. 154.

nothing but a public officer; besides, this state can scarcely be considered as purely Grecian. In Bœotia, whither Opheltas of Thessaly had conducted the Bœotians⁵⁹, the last king on record⁶⁰ is Xanthus, who fell in single combat against Melanthus; in Achaia the regal office ended with Ogyges⁶¹; in Arcadia Aristocrates appears to have been the last king of the united state of Orchomenus and Trapezus⁶²; however, the word Basileus occurs as late as the Peloponnesian war, in reference to Orchomenus, it is true upon very uncertain testimony⁶³. In Argos the dignity continued to subsist, but latterly deprived of all power till after the great Persian war⁶⁴. In Cyrene it still maintained itself after the constitution⁶⁵ of Demonax, (between 550—530, B. C.⁶⁶;) the atrocities of Pheretima exhibit it under the aspect of oriental degeneracy⁶⁷, and she herself may be compared to an Amastris or Parysatis. The subject of Athens will be more fully treated below⁶⁸.

II. THE DOMINANT CLASS.

a. The Hereditary Nobility.

§ 30. Before the nature of the political authorities in the various constitutions which arose after the kingly office had ceased can be discussed, we must ascertain the legal relation in which the aggregate inhabitants of the state stood towards the supreme political power, and the basis on

⁵⁹ Plut. Cim. 1.

⁶⁰ Paus. 9. 5. 8.

⁶² Paus. 8. 5. 8.

⁶⁴ Müller, Dor. 2. 108. 109.

⁶⁶ Herod. 4. 161.

⁶⁸ See § 45.

⁶¹ Strab. 8. 384; Polyb. 2. 41.

⁶³ Ps. Plut. Parall. 7. 243.

⁶⁵ Thrig. h. Cyren. 167, sqq.

⁶⁷ Herod. 4. 102, sqq.

which the claims to participation in the government were established. If we direct our attention to the progressive stages of development, what we first of all observe is not a general citizenship, but a division of the collective members of the state into a higher and a lower class, without any community of civil rights. We shall, therefore, first treat of these two classes, and afterwards of that which they possessed in common, and whereby both, in conjunction as citizens, were contradistinguished from non-citizens. Amongst the former the hereditary nobility came forward with the most prominent characteristics.

How soon in the earliest stages of civil polity, after such as were distinguished by eminent qualities had established themselves as chiefs, every species of distinction which proceeded from personal merit began to be looked upon as descendible, has been already adverted to¹; but even after the heroic age it was a popular notion amongst the Greeks who were not yet capable of abstract speculation, that the transmission of a right by descent was valid; thus the Athenian populace, proud of the right of citizenship they possessed by virtue of their extraction, asserted a pre-eminence over those who were destitute of such claims. This respect for the perpetuation of a right by birth and descent, the relation in which a son, as the possessor of certain rights, stands towards his father as the source whence he derives them, has been expressed by more than one Greek phrase². Hence the continuance or the speedy revival of the hereditary nobility in the new-founded states was inevitable.

¹ See § 17.

² See Append. x.

Our attention must first be directed to the princely nobility transmitted from the heroic age, which continued to subsist in the states that had sustained no change through the migrations, but which appertained to numerous leaders of the migratory hordes, and derived new force and sanction from the alliances they contracted with the chiefs of the country. After the abolition of the princely government this assumed the nature of a superior nobility invested with oligarchical authority, or when the range of the sharers in the government became more extended, that of a particular order in the class of the governing, distinguished by especial honours. Houses of this description were the Codridæ or Medontiadæ in Athens, to which the Alcmaeonidæ³ became allied by marriage; the Neleidæ⁴ in Miletus; the Basilidæ in Erythræ from Cnopus⁵; the Basileis⁶ in Ephesus from Androcles, all three races descendants of Codrus; the Penthilidæ⁷ in Mitylene from Penthelus, the son of Orestes. Sprung from princely nobility of genuine or reputed Heraclid origin were the Bacchiadæ in Corinth⁸; the Ctesippidæ in Epidaurus⁹, and most probably in Cleonæ¹⁰; the Eratidæ¹¹, to which belonged the noble Diagoras, in Rhodes; the Hippotadæ¹² in Cnidos and on the island of Cos; the Aleuadæ¹³ at Larissa in Thessaly; the

³ See Böckh, Pind. expl. 300, sqq.

⁴ § 29. n. 33.

⁵ Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 4; comp. § 29, n. 35.

⁶ Strab. 14. 633. Suid. Πυθάγορας has Βασιλιδαί. Comp. § 29. n. 34.

⁷ Aristot. Pol. 5. 8. 13.

⁸ Herod. 5. 92; Paus. 2. 4. 4. In Miletus there were also Βακχιάδαι, Hesych. Βακχ. Were they related to the others?

⁹ Paus. 3. 16. 5; Schol. Soph. Trach. 55.

¹⁰ Müller, Dor. 1. 81; 2. 109.

¹¹ Böckh. Pind. expl. 165; Müller, Dor. 2. 147.

¹² Diodor. 5. 9. 53; Tietz, 3; Lycoph. 1388.

¹³ § 29. n. 27.

Thespiadæ¹⁴, seven houses in Thespiæ, descended from Hercules and the daughters of the mythical prince Thespius; the Phalanthiadæ in Tarentum¹⁵, from the leader of the expedition to that place. The Emmenidæ, in Gela and Agrigentum¹⁶, derived themselves from the race of Polynices, not to mention the possible descendants of Theras in Thera, concerning whom no exact particulars are known; from Minyas, the Psoloeis and Œonolai in Orchomenus¹⁷; from Opheltas, the leader of the Bœotians from Thessaly, the Opheltiadæ in Thebes¹⁸, where the Cleonymidæ were considered as related to the royal house of Labdacus¹⁹. The Ioxidæ²⁰ in Caria pretended to trace themselves to Ioxus, the grandson of Theseus, the Cinyradæ²¹ in Cyprus to the renowned Cinyras; and lastly, the Deucalionidæ²² in Delphi carried their pedigree to a most incredible height.

The Theban Sparti²³ were, it is true, not precisely sprung from the heroic princely blood, but were descended from the most ancient military nobility, and the confidants of the Cadmean princes. Their name reminds us of Autochthones, and was interpreted accordingly, being proverbially used to designate ancient or native nobility²⁴; their genuine-

¹⁴ Diod. 4, 29. 41; 5. 15.

¹⁵ Schol. Horat. Od. 2. 5. 12; comp. Steph. Byz. 'Αθηναί, where, however, Tarentines in general are meant.

¹⁶ Müller, Orchom. 329; Böckh. Pind. expl. 115.

¹⁷ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 198.

¹⁸ Plut. de Sera. Num. Vindict. 8. 208. 209.

¹⁹ See Dissen ad Pind. Isthm. 3. p. 499, sqq.

²⁰ Plut. Thes. 8.

²¹ Pind. Pyth. 2. 27, sqq.; and Schol. Apollod. 3. 14. 3.

²² Plut. Qu. Gr. n. 9.

²³ Σπάρτων γένος, Æschyl. Eum. 400. Σπαρτούς ἀνακτας, Eurip. Phœn. 1022; comp. 954. 1015; Schol. on 674. 941. 944; Pind. Pyth. 9. 145; Schol. Isthm. 7. 13; 1. 41; comp. Dissen. ad Pind. p. 535; Schol. Apoll. Rh. 3. 1178, 1185; Hygin. 67.: Draconteum genus; comp. 178.

²⁴ Platon. Sophist. 247. C.

ness was said to be discoverable by a mark on their body²⁵; Epaminondas descended from one line of them²⁶; and some of them were yet in existence at the time of Plutarch²⁷. The Gephyræi, the race from which the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogiton²⁸ were descended, asserted that they were sprung from companions of Cadmus. Very slight indeed was the connection between the heroic age and nine families in Trœzen, which boasted that their ancestors had once purified Orestes from the guilt of murder²⁹; amongst the hundred noble families in the Italian Locri, which derived their origin from some of those noble virgins who, according to the tradition, it had been once necessary to send annually to Ilium³⁰, to atone for the impiety of Ajax, the son of Oileus; in Ithaca, the Colidæ and Bucolii called themselves descendants of the Homeric shepherds Eumæus and Philoitius³¹, and the heralds in Sparta descendants of Talthybius³².

The sacerdotal nobility which, as was observed above, was incorporated with the general nobility of the land, so as to enhance the estimation in which this was held, in consequence of the peculiar qualifications requisite for the priesthood, and the sacred art of the soothsayers and physicians perpetuated in exclusive bodies, required a rigorous family-scrutiny; and this, to a certain extent, con-

²⁵ Dion. Chrys. 1. 149: *σημεῖον λέγεται εἶναι τοῦ γένους, λόγῃ τις, οἶμαι, ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος*. Comp. Hygin. 72.

²⁶ Paus. 8. 11. 5.

²⁷ Plut. de Sera. Numin. Vindict. 8. 228. Consult, on this extensive subject in general, Ionsius, de Spartis in Græv. Synt. dissert. 210.

²⁸ Herodot. 5. 55. 57.

²⁹ Paus. 2. 31; 7. 11; 1. 22. 2; comp. Müller, Dor. 1. 333.

³⁰ Aristot. ap. Polyb. 12. 5. 6, sqq.

³¹ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 180.

³² Herodot. 7. 134.

tinued to be exercised till a very late age; the beginning of the line was naturally sought in the heroic time, and gods and princes were gorgeously announced as its founders; the prophetic race of the Iamidæ³³ from Olympia, disseminated through a number of Grecian states, Laconia, Arcadia, Syracuse, etc., derived its origin from Iamus, a son of Apollo and Evadne; the Branchidæ at Miletus from Apollo's son Branchus³⁴; the Asclepiadæ in Epidaurus, Cos³⁵, etc., the Eumolpidæ in Athens and Eleusis³⁶, the Ceryces³⁷, were said to be descended from the sons of gods in those places; and the Clytiadæ³⁸ in Elis, from the celebrated prophet and prince Melampus. Certain houses, like that of the Attic Eteobutad³⁹ Peripoltas, who accompanied Opheltas to Bœotia in the capacity of seer, occupied a lower position in the genealogical scale; but this was still in existence at Cheronea⁴⁰ at the time of Plutarch; that of the Lycomedæ in Athens, from which came Themistocles⁴¹, and of Telines, from whom Gelon's ancestors in Gela had inherited a priesthood⁴².

As next in importance to the princely nobility transmitted from the heroic age, must be added the houses of those founders of states, who, it is true, had not inherited heroic nobility, but who, from their exalted rank in the new states, and through the honour of the heroic worship which generally fell to their share, conferred upon their

³³ See at large, Boeckh, Pind. expl. 152. 153.

³⁴ Conon, 33.

³⁵ Sprengel, Gesch. d. Med. 1. 340, sqq.

³⁶ Creuzer, Symb. 4. 355; comp. Müller, Prolegom. 250, sqq.

³⁷ See Zeibich de Cerycib. mystic. Creuzer, Symb. 4. 356. 357.

³⁸ Boeckh, Pind. expl. 315.

³⁹ See their pedigree in Müller, Minerv. Poliad. Sacra, p. 8. ⁴⁰ Plut. Cim. 8.

⁴¹ Paus. 9. 27. 2; Plut. Them. 1; comp. Müller, ubi sup. 44, sqq.

⁴² Herod. 7. 154; Schol. Pind. p. 2. 27.

posterity a certain splendour of illustrious birth. Such were the Protiadæ in Massilia, descended from the Phocæan mariner Protis and the daughter of a Gallic king⁴³, whom he espoused before the settlement on the site of Massilia. Least furnished with the stamp of ancient birth, and purely derived from a more recent age, was the nobility conferred by participation in an expedition and the foundation of a state. Houses of this description, from the increase of which the nobility before described may have forfeited various privileges, formed the aristocracy in Apollonia and Thera⁴⁴; it is probable that the numerous illustrious races in Ægina⁴⁵ extolled by Pindar, were of a similar description, such as the Myletidæ in Syracuse⁴⁶, etc. Lastly, it is worthy of remark, that in those districts which like Attica preserved the population of the heroic age in its greatest purity, Autochthony was a subject of pride and a mark of nobility⁴⁷; whilst in such as had been colonised, the name of the ancient and aboriginal inhabitants was regarded with contempt, as of the Iagnetes in Rhodes⁴⁸ and the Thebageneis⁴⁹.

Of what description therefore were the qualifications which permanently determined the rank and rights of the nobility as the governing order of the country? In this enquiry it is necessary to postpone the consideration of the hereditary distinctions of birth and family, and first of all to

⁴³ Athen. 13. 576. A. B. Hesychius somewhat singularly has, Ὀψαλίδαι οἱ ἀρχηγέται τῶν Αἰτωλῶν.

⁴⁴ Aristot. Pol. 4. 5. 8: ἐν ταῖς τιμαῖς ἦσαν οἱ διαφέροντες κατ' εὐγένειαν καὶ πρῶτον κατασχόντες τὰς ἀποικίας. Concerning the duty of the nobility in Apollonia to guard the sacred sheep of the sun, see Herod. 9. 93.

⁴⁵ See Append. vii.

⁴⁶ Thuc. 6. 5.

⁴⁷ See Append. xi.

⁴⁸ Hesych. Ἰγνητες. Comp. Steph. Byz. Γνής, on the Eteocrates, see Höckh Creta, 1. 140, sqq.

⁴⁹ § 34. η. 25.

examine the external qualifications, which, in the more ancient as well as in the modern states, were looked upon as the basis of rights and pretensions. This consisted in the possession of land, which, as already stated, was probably promised to those who accompanied an expedition⁵⁰, and to which were annexed obligations towards the state, especially that of bearing arms for it, whilst this was again associated with military honour and the use of a nobler sort of weapons. This endowment, a reward for services performed and to be performed, is exhibited to us in the infancy of the new-founded states, in the light of a nobility of merit: this relation must, however, soon have been superseded by one of another description. For the adequate estimation of personal merit, which in the nature of things must continually be recurring, as constantly requires a return to general principles; by which it must be determined what position in the state individuals are entitled to occupy as men and as citizens. But to prevent the confusion liable to arise from such a wavering state of things, it is requisite that there should exist a supreme authority, firmly established, endowed with political intelligence, and possessed of the necessary power to carry into operation those measures which it shall deem conducive to the welfare of the community. The nearest approach to this standard of perfection, with which we are acquainted, is the regal office; but how deficient in these attributes was the monarchy of the age that followed the great migrations—a narrowly limited authority, which bore within itself the seeds of its own de-

⁵⁰ Thus the Cyrenæans invited people to dwell, ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνάδασμῳ, Herod. 4. 159; comp. 4. 163. After the development of the democratic principle, on the other hand, the expression was ἐπὶ τῇ ἰσῳ καὶ ὁμοίᾳ, Thuc. 1. 27.

struction! Hence, we soon behold revived in the Grecian states of more recent origin, that principle which had prevailed in those of the heroic age, and is rooted in the nature of all earthly polities, viz. the hereditary transmission of distinctions, which were in the first instance granted to merit alone; the external endowments with property, the obligation to services for its possession, and the rank associated with it, were continued by descent in particular families; the nobility maintained the purity of their race by refusing to intermarry with the inferior classes, as was the case with the Bacchiadæ⁵¹; in some instances, as in Leucas⁵², even the alienation of property was prohibited, and their power consequently the more firmly established. It results therefore that the hereditary nobility who at the decline of the kingly power constituted the governing order, were distinguished by these three characteristics: the possession of property, military honour, and the hereditary transmission of these privileges, together with which the sacerdotal character may occasionally be discerned, but, as has been several times observed, not so as to mark a distinct class.

As landed proprietors, the nobility were called Gamori⁵³; this appellation was however peculiar to the Doric states, and to Syracuse in particular⁵⁴. Here the Gamori were the possessors of the land, who themselves dwelt in the city, the seat of government, and kept husbandmen

⁵¹ Herod. 5. 92. ὧν ἐδίδουσαν δὲ καὶ ἦγον ἐξ ἀλλήλων.

⁵² Aristot. Pol. 2. 4. 4.

⁵³ See Valcken. ad Herod. 5. 77; 66. 22; Ruhnke. ad Tim. 67; Hesych. Γάμοροι· οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐγγείων τιμημάτων τὰ κοινὰ διέποντες. This alludes to liturgies, wherefore Ruhnken's alteration into κτημάτων is unnecessary.

⁵⁴ Herod. 7. 155; Diod. Frag. V. 4. 26. Bipont, where see Vales. and Wessel. Concerning Argos, see Æschyl. Supplic. 678.

on their estates; nevertheless upon the occupation of the country the ancient inhabitants in some instances retained their landed possessions, as in Phlius⁵⁵, etc., but they can hardly have had an equal right to form part of the governing order; again, the noblest and bravest of the new settlers received larger shares, to which were attached more valuable privileges. The same practice prevailed in Attica⁵⁶; the husbandmen paid a rent to the noble landlords; but the denominations were not synonymous, for the word Geomori in Attica was employed for the agricultural labourers in the service of the nobility termed Eupatridæ; it is probable, that the word Cleruchi, afterwards used in Attic politics, was of more ancient use⁵⁷; and this may have been the real name of the Samian nobility, who are called Geomori⁵⁸ by an authority in whom no great faith is to be reposed.

The military title of the nobility was Hippeis⁵⁹, knights. In several states, in accordance with the nature of the country, cavalry formed the nucleus of the armed force, and was, therefore, the noblest kind of service; with this was coupled the possession of landed property, large tracts of land being bestowed upon them for the keep of their horses, or, as was effected by Phidon in Cuma⁶⁰, their own possessions were laid under contribution for that object. In these countries, therefore, nobility and cavalry were virtually identical terms⁶¹, as, for

⁵⁵ See § 33. n. 10, sqq.

⁵⁶ See § 44. n. 15.

⁵⁷ Near Cyzicus there was a district called κληρος, Polyæn, 1. 40. 9; comp. Timæus, γεωμόροι κληροῦχοι.

⁵⁸ Plut. Quæst. Græc. 7. 211. 212.

⁵⁹ Aristot. Pol. 4. 10; 10. 11; in Chalcis ἵπποβόται, Herod. 5. 77: in Lebadea ἱππόται; in Argum 5. Pind. Nem. στρατιωτικὸν γένος.

⁶⁰ Heracl. Pont. 11.

⁶¹ Aristot. Pol. 4. 3. 2, ὅσαις πόλεσιν ἐν τοῖς ἵπποις ἡ δύναμις ἦν, ὀλιγαρχίαι παρὰ τοῦτοις ἦσαν, comp. 6. 4. 3.

instance, in Thebes⁶², Thespiæ⁶³, Lebadea⁶⁴, Orchomenus⁶⁵, in Chalcis and Eretrian Eubœa⁶⁶, in Magnesia on the Mæander⁶⁷, and most probably in Colophon⁶⁸, Crete⁶⁹, and in Cyrene, where the nobility were called Capetii⁷⁰. Amongst the Dorians, heavy-armed infantry constituted the national force⁷¹, whereas the cavalry was very imperfectly organized; nevertheless, the word Hoplitæ will hardly be found in any state as an appellation for military nobility⁷². In Sparta, where there was no cavalry whatever till the time of the Peloponnesian war⁷³, the noble youth of the army were called Hippeis⁷⁴. The foregoing observations prove that the important passage in Aristotle⁷⁵, which states that the monarchy was immediately succeeded by the aristocracy of knights of noble birth, and this again by a democracy of the collective Hoplitæ, will, upon an attentive examination of the subject, be found inapplicable to the majority of the Doric states.

Under each of the two names mentioned above, which designate the external endowments of the nobility with property and military rank, are naturally included such families as were distinguished by more ancient and superior nobility; and, by virtue of their right to inherit these distinctions,

⁶² Θῆβαι εὐῖπποι, Eurip. Phœn. 17; πολυάρματοι, Soph. Antig. 149; ἐνάρματοι, 845; πλήξειπποι, Pind. Ol. 6. 145.

⁶³ At least there were Eilarcheons there, see Müller, Orch. 4. 1.

⁶⁴ Inscript. Wheeler, 374.

⁶⁵ Diod. 15. 79.

⁶⁶ Strab. 10. 448; Valcken. ad. Herod. 6. 22; Tittmann, gr. Staatsv. 648.

⁶⁷ Aristot. Pol. 4. 3. 2.

⁶⁸ Heindorf ad Plat. Theæt. § 27; compare above, § 23. n. 13.

⁶⁹ Ephor. ap. Strab. 10. 481.

⁷⁰ Hesych. Καπήτιοι οἱ περιφανεῖς τῆς Κυρήνης; compare ἀρμεθεῖς.

⁷¹ Müller, Dor. 1. 77. Hence the words γυμνήτες, γυμνήσιοι, were applied to the lower orders, and the bondmen in Argos (Pohl. 3. 82); compare Müller, Dor. 2. 55.

⁷² On the Attic Ὀπλητες, see § 43.

⁷³ Thucyd. 4. 55; compare Strab. 10. 481.

⁷⁴ Müller, Dor. 2. 241.

⁷⁵ Pol. 4. 10; 10. 11.

the landed proprietors and knights of the country were, like the older nobility by right of birth, denominated Eupatridæ, Eugeneis⁷⁶.

b. The Rich.

§ 31. However easily the personal authority of such as were possessed of landed property and military distinction might have assumed an hereditary character, it nevertheless seems to have been necessary for the further continuance of hereditary power in the nobility, at a time when youthful feelings and aspirations characterised the Greeks, that the nobles should maintain their footing as the nucleus of the armed force, and as landed proprietors in the state. On the other hand, the alienation of landed possessions, and retirement from the career of arms, exposed them to a danger against which illustrious birth alone was not a sufficient security. For the source from which nobility had emanated did not cease to flow; the warlike exploits of the lower orders, and the prosperity which arose without the circle of the nobility, laid the foundation for claims in that class of the people, which, though less entitled to assert them, was numerically superior; and although these claims were not directed to the object of raising themselves to noble rank, by virtue of the same conditions which had once called the nobility into existence, they were, nevertheless, impatient of the rank the nobility asserted as an aristocracy; and the estimation in which the worth and merit of a citizen, upon whom particular privileges were to be

⁷⁶ Aristot. Pol. 4. 6, 5; *Εὐγένεια ἐστὶν ἀρχαῖος πλοῦτος καὶ ἀρετή*. The denominations of the nobility by birth will be fully illustrated in the second volume.

conferred, were held by the lower orders, in spite of all their national reverence for heroic descent, now became associated with the possession of eminent personal qualities, or with wealth and property, and the civil benefits which might thence result to the state. To keep this aspiring disposition within due bounds, and to preserve the balance between its growing pretensions and those of the hereditary proprietors of the soil, was a task accomplished in but few of the Grecian states; and in those it was effected by the wisdom of the legislators and the force of immemorial usage, when the merit of the warrior had, from the earliest times, asserted a pre-eminence, as amongst the Malians and Arcadians, and still more, when it was supported by an equality of possessions, as in Sparta. On the other hand, in most of the remaining states the class of the rich trenched more and more upon the nobility by descent. Riches became the cry of the people¹, and even diminished the respect for that manly virtue which was not yet wholly extinguished, and still evinced itself in enterprise and action. The love of wealth was in every age peculiar to the Grecian character; the estimation of the person according to the standard of property, was essentially grounded in the tendency to navigation and commerce. When maritime trade began to flourish, and wealth became more easy of acquirement, movables and the precious metals were more highly valued than the substantial property of land; the multitudes that embraced a seafaring life, at the same time altered the estimation in which the military profession was held; notwithstanding knights or Hoplitæ still continued to be

¹ *Χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνὴρ*, Pind. Isthm. 2. 17; Dissen. Expl. 492.

the most distinguished portion of the military force, yet from the necessity that existed for seamen, there arose a dangerous counterpoise to the authority of the nobility, whose calling and honour centered in the land service; hence the pretensions of the lower orders unfolded themselves in their full force after the naval battles with the Persians. However, in states which were enriched by navigation and trade, the wealth which was thus acquired might very easily be added to the possessions of the noble landholders, who had been concerned in fitting out vessels, and they themselves thus preserve their ancient pre-eminence in point of property; when the Grecian historians and politicians, therefore, afterwards characterised the aristocracy as the class of the rich², and declared a share in the government to be based upon the principle of valuation³, in allusion to the political affairs of the age before the Persian war, as in the aristocracy of the Hippobotæ in Chalcis⁴, the Rhegians⁵, Agrigentans⁶, etc., this is by no means to be understood of property and rights, constantly varying, and only attached to the person of the holders for the time being; hereditary nobility possessed of property, or, at least, a class in which the hereditary nobility had the ascendant, is a far more natural interpretation, and is supported by historical authority; for example, amongst the Rhegians none but those who originally belonged to the Messenian tribe could obtain a share in the government⁷.

² Πλούσιοι, παχέες, Herod. Thucyd. etc.

³ 'Απὸ τιμημάτων, Plat. de Repub. 8. 550. C. sqq.; ἐκ τῶν τιμῶν Aristot. Pol. 5. 8. 4.

⁴ Aristot. ap. Strab. 10. 447, ἀπὸ τιμημάτων ἀριστοκρατικῶς ἄρχοντες; Plut. Pericl. 23, πλούτῳ καὶ δόξῃ διαφέροντες.

⁵ Αἰρετοὶ ἀπὸ τιμημάτων, Heracl. Pont. 25.

⁶ Aristot. Pol. 5. 8. 4.

⁷ Strab. 6. 257.

Considerable agitation seems to have prevailed in most of the Grecian states towards the end of the age which preceded the Persian wars; in Miletus there was a struggle between the rich nobility, called Plutis, from their riches, or Plontis, from their ships, and the lower order, denominated Cheiromacha⁸; the Gamori in Syracuse were expelled by the demus⁹, etc.; the political importance of wealth with a change of families, and without regard to the question, whether it had descended by inheritance and was associated with hereditary nobility, or was attached to such citizens as had but recently attained rank and station; the principle, therefore, of the census was established in certain states by means of express constitutions, and this was in some instances attended by an entire change in the public system, as was the case in Athens, under Solon, and in Cuma under Phidon¹⁰. In many others, similar changes were probably effected by convention, or, as amongst the Milesians, through the decree of an intervening state¹¹, or even from the encroachments of the bulk of the people, who forced themselves into the actual enjoyment of civil rights. This is a subject which will be more fully investigated in future chapters.

III. THE COMMON FREEMEN.

§ 32. Whilst in the infancy of those states which arose after the heroic age, the nobles come forward with such prominent and decided characteristics, owing to the external qualifications they retained,

⁸ Plut. Quæst. Gr. 7. 193: conf. Heracl. Pont. ap. Ath. 12. 524. Only one of the readings in Plutarch can be correct; according to his account, the rich were likewise called *ἀειναῦται*, and this supports the reading *πλουτίς*.
⁹ Herod. 7. 155. ¹⁰ Heracl. P. 11. ¹¹ Herod. 5. 28.

the lower orders appear to have been for a considerable space of time destitute of all certain and regular form. In those states whose population had not become mixed through migrations, their condition was, for several centuries, unaffected by any particular variation; in others, where the invading tribes formed the dominant class, the lower order consisted partly of the former occupants of the conquered country, as in Thessaly, Laconia, Elis, and the territory of Argus and Epidaurus, partly of the common and undistinguished mass which composed the migratory hordes, and had either remained in a subordinate station during and after the expedition, or, even supposing it to have acquired, for a time, property and privileges, very soon descended to its real level amongst nobler associates, and lastly, of after-comers. Thus Messenians and Chalcidians migrated to Rhegium; the latter, a body devoted to the Delphic god, were henceforward placed upon a servile footing¹; numerous husbandmen, from the Corinthian village of Tenea² went with Archias to Syracuse, where they probably formed a portion of the lower class. This class, whose most usual designation, *Demus*³, like the Roman word *Plebs*, became gradually extended, from the signification of a body subordinate to the nobility, to that of the aggregate people, and whose development was accompanied by an analogous progress in the idea of the legal rights associated with it, were not citizens in the same sense of the word as the nobility, but formed a sort of substratum⁴ to them, without political

¹ Strab. 6. 257.² Strab. 8. 380.³ See Append. viii.⁴ Aristot. Pol. 4. 10. 11, assigns as a reason for the existence of royal and oligarchical governments in the infancy of states, that the middle class was not

station or agency themselves, and bordered closely upon the nature of a servile order. The opposition between the nobility and the Demus, which gradually rose from this condition to the enjoyment of political rights, must be considered in a two-fold point of view—as beheld in the maritime and in the inland states.

In the former, which from their devoting little or no attention to navigation, we shall call land-states, it is necessary to observe the distinction between *the town* and *the country*, the former implying the seat of government, and the latter the dependent rural district in its vicinity. It has been shown above⁵ that the erection of towns was a prominent feature in the political changes effected in the state-system of Greece, and one of its principal causes; they were observed to rise in the greatest number in those districts which had been colonised; spacious towns were built at the foot of the citadels belonging to the ancient princes, in which the military retainers took up their quarters in the same manner as in a knightly castle, and even though destitute of the external distinctives of public buildings and fortifications, Sparta, for example, at first probably rather bearing the appearance of a camp than a city, whilst the public edifices of Elis were not erected till after the Persian wars⁶, the town nevertheless formed the central point of government. Thus in Elis Oxylus received the inhabitants of various townships into the city⁷; hence the followers of Cresphontes insisted that he should found⁸ one town, and not five;

numerous—δὲ ὀλιγανθρωπίαν γὰρ οὐκ εἶχον πόλιν τὸ μέσον—this, however, appears untenable.

⁵ § 21; comp. Append. viii.

⁶ Strab. 8. 336.

⁷ Paus. 5. 4. 1.

⁸ Ephor. ap. Strab. 8. 361; comp. Paus. 4. 3. 4.

and on that account the collection of the country people into towns (*συνοικισμός*) became a means to promote democracy. From designating the member of the community of a town in this sense, the word townsman was accordingly employed to signify state-citizen, full citizen. On the other hand, dwelling around the town, taking no part in town affairs, and fulfilling the political destination in a servile cultivation of the soil, were the characteristic marks of the lower class; and hence arose the appellation *Periœci*⁹. This is described by the ancients as the peculiar attribute of the Lacedæmonians, in contradistinction to the inhabitants of the capital, Sparta¹⁰, the occupants of the country round about the towns in Crete¹¹, and the dwellers around Argos¹² and Elis¹³: but if we strictly examine the political relation of the lower class, instead of regarding the indefinite expressions of the ancients, we shall find that the same character applies to the Attic Thetes¹⁴, the Demus of Epidaurus¹⁵, the twenty-five townships¹⁶ belonging to Sybaris, Messenia¹⁷, etc.

The condition of these *Periœci*, as far as political rights were concerned, was neither uniform in every place, nor the same at all times in single states¹⁸, but varied from a condition closely bordering on citizenship to the confines of bondage.

⁹ See Append. viii.

¹⁰ Herod. 6. 58; 9. 11.

¹¹ Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 1; Sosicrat. ap. Ath. 6. 263. F.

¹² Aristot. Pol. 5. 2. 8; Plut. de Mulier. Virtut. 7. 11. from which the word *δοῦλοι*, improperly used by Herod. 6. 83. must be emended. Comp. Herodotus himself, 8. 73.

¹³ Thuc. 2. 25; Xenoph. Hell. 3. 2. 23.

¹⁴ Concerning the word, see Append. xii. on the subject itself below, § 44.

¹⁵ Τοῦ δὲ δήμου τὸ πλεῖστον ἐν ἀγρῷ διέτριβεν, Plut. Quæst. Gr. 1.

¹⁶ Πέντε δὲ καὶ εἴκοσι πόλεις ὑπηκόους ἔσχε, Strab. 6. 263.

¹⁷ See n. 8.

¹⁸ It was stipulated in the first treaty that Sparta's *Periœci* should be — *ισονόμους* — *μετέχοντας πολιτείας καὶ ἀρχαίων*, Ephor. ap. Strab. 8. 364.

In the first place, it is necessary to draw an accurate line of distinction between Periœci and bondsmen generally. The vague manner in which these appellations were employed, no less than their resemblance in political condition, has caused the Periœci to be so frequently confounded with those whose station was in reality much lower, namely, the Penestæ and Helots: the former were nowhere utterly divested of the character of citizens, and bondsmen or slaves, in the strict sense of the term, although the nobility, as in Sicyon and Epidaurus, in order to distinguish them from the rest of the population, compelled them to wear the rustic dress of the sheepskin, and degraded them by nicknames¹⁹, a proceeding for the most part ascribed to the tyrants; their relation may be distinctly recognised as that of an intermediate class between the nobles and slaves in Laconia, where the Helots stood below the Periœci, and constituted the class of slaves, properly so called, like the Aphamiotæ in Crete, and the Callicryrians in Syracuse²⁰. The subordinate relation in which the Periœci stood towards the capital of the country, occasioned their townships and districts to be distinguished by a dependent character; hence, Xenophon²¹ calls Thespiæ, etc. towns of the Periœci belonging to Thebes; the Triphylians, he, as well

¹⁹ Κατωνακοφόροι, "sheepskin-wearers," and κορυνηφόροι "cudgel-bearers" in Sicyon; Theopomp. ap. Ath. 6. 271. D.; Poll. 3. 82; Steph. Byz. *Xios*; Etym. M. *Εἰλωτες*; comp. Ruhnke ad Tim. 213; *Κονίποδες*, "dusty-footed," in Epidaurus, Plut. Qu. Gr. 1. To the same class probably belonged the Corinthian *Κυνόφαλοι*, who appear to have derived their name from the dog-skin cap which they wore. In Hesych. they are called *φνλή*, on which account I cannot with Müller, Dor. 2. 59. consider them as a sort of Helots; comp. § 51. n. 11.

²⁰ See concerning all, § 34.

²¹ Hell. 5. 4. 46.

as Pausanias²², denominates the Perioeci of Elis: but it is necessary to observe, that notwithstanding their subordinate position with respect to legal rights, they still constituted integral parts of that state, from the centre of whose capital they were governed, but were in themselves devoid of the character of a community; which was a very different relation from that of confederate towns, although they might be dependent upon a powerful ally, as well as merely tributary or kindred places, such as the Triphylian Lepreum²³, and the Thessalian mountain tribes²⁴, as long as they were not internally incorporated with the governing state. Nevertheless the relation of several places inhabited by Perioeci, was assimilated to that of towns dependent upon Hegemony, as for instance that of the Orneatians in Argolis²⁵. In the maritime states, which did not possess an extensive landed territory adapted to the objects of agriculture, or which did not make agriculture the basis of their public economy, a considerable portion of the lower class generally resided in the town; as in those of Sicily²⁶, the Cheiromacha in Miletus²⁷, etc. These were, according to circumstances, either seamen or handicraftsmen; thus they were fishermen in Tarentum and Byzantium²⁸, and artisans in Corinth²⁹. Demus is in this case the common denomination, and with this appellation is connected the increase in the political importance

²² Hell. 3. 2. 23. 30; Paus. 3. 8. 2.

²³ Thuc. 5. 31; comp. § 13. n. 38.

²⁵ Herod. 8. 73; comp. Müll. Dor. 1. 83; 2. 57.

²⁶ Herod. 7. 155. 156.

²⁸ Aristot. Pol. 4. 4. 1. 7.

²⁴ See § 26. n. 37.

²⁷ § 31. n. 8.

²⁹ Strab. 8. 382.

of the lower class³⁰. A prescriptive difference of ranks was more easily effaced where the classes resided together, from the part taken by the nobility in maritime affairs, and the share the lower order received of the profits; henceforward wealth became the general standard, and aspiring pretensions in the democracy were much more likely to arise from such a state of things than from the rustic simplicity of the Pericæci. In Athens, at a later period, the harbour of Piræus was marked by a more democratic character than the adjacent capital³¹.

IV. CITIZENSHIP IN GENERAL.

§ 33. We have seen, that except in those states, where legislation very soon regulated the relations subsisting amongst their members, the personal essence of pure citizenship is not to be ascribed to the lower order, any more than its distinctive feature is to be defined as a share in the supreme power; this was not possessed by that order whose condition was alike devoid of systematic form and legal rights, nor was it deprived of the same by any temporary usurpation or encroachments on the part of the nobility, but its earliest state was politically passive, whence it had gradually to work its way to the acquisition of a share in free and influential agency. The true nature of that citizenship which was common to both orders, will therefore be best understood by comparing it with that which was opposed to it. Opposed to the per-

³⁰ See Append. viii.

³¹ Aristot. Pol. 5. 2. 12. classes Colophon and Clazomenæ with Athens; it was possibly the same case there.

sonally free were the personally non-free, and to permanent residents and persons considered as natives, foreigners, or aliens.

To guard against any misconception as to the true nature of the former, it must be repeated, that although the lower class was destitute of all share in the government, and in some states was, in fact, scarcely distinguished from the slaves properly so called, it was, nevertheless, not so wholly devoid of the character of citizenship, that the aristocracy could be entitled to look upon this as their exclusive attribute, and regard themselves as alone capable of complying with its requisites; the rank asserted by the nobles as citizens invested with higher privileges, by no means served wholly to shut out the lower class from civil and political freedom. Even Gelon, who acted according to the right of conquest, did not reduce the Demus of the conquered Sicilian states Megara and Eubœa to the state of bondsmen in their own country, but sold them into captivity out of Sicily¹. Exceptions arising out of the provisions of private law, as when, in Thebes, foundlings became the bondsmen of him who educated them², or, in Athens, redeemed prisoners of war were the property of him who had ransomed them in case they neglected to repay the ransom³, and in general, that the strict law of debt could reduce to slavery⁴, concern individuals only, not a whole class; moreover, in the two last cases the body was only supposed to be temporarily impawned till the debt should be discharged.

¹ Herod. 7. 156.

² Ælian. V. H. 2. 7.

³ Demosth. c. Nicos. 1250.

⁴ Photius *συσταχθία*.

But what mainly served to remove the barrier which had separated the lower order from the aristocracy, in such a manner that the former could be regarded in the false light of a servile class, was that the common freemen, like the nobility, had a class of this nature assigned to them as a political substratum, by which means they became exempted from the necessity of providing for the common exigencies of life, and enabled to qualify themselves for political agency. If this does not necessarily imply any immediate relation to political power, it is at least one of the most important modifications of general citizenship in Greece. A servile class of this nature arose in the interval between the first great migrations and the wars with the Persians, in the Grecian states generally, with the exception of Phocis⁵ and the Italian Locri⁶, and was composed either of the former occupants of the country reduced to a state of bondage, or of purchased slaves; sometimes the two were combined, as was the case in Crete with the Aphamiotæ and Chrysoneti⁷. But the necessity that one or the other should form a basis for the citizenship, at length became so settled and general an opinion amongst all ranks of the nation, that even the most humane and high-minded politicians of antiquity, Plato and Aristotle, retained it in their theories as a universally acknowledged principle. This servile class was, therefore, like an instrument for the welfare and perfectibility of the free citizen of the state; its legitimate mission was

⁵ Athen., 6. 264, C.

⁶ Timæus ap Polyb. 12. 6.; compare Ath. 6. 264 C.; 272 A.

⁷ Athen. 6. 263. Concerning the Aphamiotæ, see the next section.

accomplished in serving without claims or obligations to superior functions either civil or domestic; but the civil class being thereby raised one step above its natural condition, and standing as it were upon artificial ground, was exonerated from a care for the common necessities of life, and furnished with greater capacities for satisfying the political claims upon it; what it lost through the instrumentality of the servile class physically, was made up by its increased political efficiency⁸. In the rudiments of the new-founded states there could exist no fixed principle of distinction between the resident, or person regarded as a native, and the alien. The wandering hordes were more or less composed of dissimilar elements; mere participation in an expedition by no means constituted the exclusive character of any privileged class arising out of it. For in many of the new states a portion of the former inhabitants of the district were first of all received as citizens, on the faith of treaties to that effect, as in Elis⁹, Phlius¹⁰, Laconia¹¹, Troezen¹², Sicyon¹³, Colophon¹⁴, Samos¹⁵, and Ephesus¹⁶. Till masses like these amalgamated, and the distinctive marks of exclusiveness could again arise, unquestionably the affair of a longer period than

⁸ See the admirable disquisition of Tittmann, gr. Staatsv. 622. where he considers the subject in the spirit of a cosmopolite.

⁹ Ephor. ap Strab. 8. 364. κατὰ συγγένειαν παλαιάν. Comp. Paus. 5. 4. 1. This is certainly not consistent with the statement in Strab. 8. 357. that the Epeans had been expelled.

¹⁰ Paus. 2. 13. 1.

¹¹ § 32. n. 17.

¹² Paus. 2. 30. 9. — ἐδέξαντο — οἱ Τροιζήνιοι συνοίκους Δωριέων τῶν ἐξ Ἀργους.

¹³ The ancient Sicyonians probably formed the fourth Phyle, Αἰγιαλεῖς. Herod. 5. 68.

¹⁴ Paus. 7. 3. 1.

¹⁵ Etym. M. Ἀστυπαλαία.

¹⁶ Paus. 7. 2. 5. This refers to those who belonged to the Ephesian sanctuary. Compare, concerning the arrangements in the colonies, Müll. Dor. 2. 61.

a single generation, the circle was not closed against new comers¹⁷, and the necessity for assistance in cases of emergency perhaps frequently facilitated their admission. It is true that, for the most part, the after-comers were only considered as partakers of the rights of the lower order; but these were, nevertheless, the basis upon which general citizenship was afterwards raised up; when they were occasionally expelled again, like the Trœzenians from Sybaris¹⁸, this may undoubtedly be considered an indication of fastidiousness in the ancient citizens, but it might also be regarded as a sign of arrogance in the new comers.

However, a relation of so lax a nature as this could not long subsist; for the citizenship, like the privileges of the nobility in the new states, soon became hereditary, and was henceforward surrounded with barriers which were closed against aliens. Within these it was transmitted, with all those rights which had adhered to it in the course of political development, and which were regarded as inseparable from it, to the following generations; the best title to it was descent¹⁹, to which head may be referred the Athenian custom of naming the grandson after the grandfather, and deducing a legal title to the franchise from the third lineal ancestor²⁰. With regard to the mothers, these rules

¹⁷ Ἐποικοί. See, on this word, Schol. 3; Thuc. 2. 27.

¹⁸ Diod. 12. 9.

¹⁹ Bekker, Anecd. 259. ἐγγενής—ἀσὺρ ἐξ ἀσὺρ. Comp. 25.: ἀνθυγενής. Ὅμηρ. ἰθαγενής—γνήσιον μὴ ἀλλοδαπὸν μηδὲ νόθον. (Thus we may explain ἰθαγενής Μιλήσιος, as applied to Thales. Diog. Laert. 1. 22.) Comp. Hesych. ἐπήλυδας.

²⁰ Ἐκ τριγωνίας, Pollux 8. 85; Strab. 4. 179. The statement in Hesych. Ἐνδοῦγεναι (accord. to Küster) οἱ ἀπὸ ἐπτά πατέρων καὶ μητέρων ἀσὺρ κατὰγοντες τὸ γένος, can hardly have applied to a Greek state.

were not very strictly observed²¹; however, it may be assumed as a general rule, that to be a partaker of the full rights of citizenship, it was requisite that both father and mother should have been citizens²²; this principle is afterwards beheld in intense operation in those states where there was a general prohibition of all intermarriage with foreigners.

After the circle of the citizenship had, by means of the right of birth, become narrowed, and at the same time its common properties had assumed a more definite form, from the marked contrast which it presented to the servile class, the character and various denominations of naturalisation²³ likewise became more fixed. No universal principles can be expected in such a multitude of separate states; many amongst them kept their citizenship rigorously closed; Sparta is said to have imparted its full freedom to two foreigners only, Tisamenus and Hegias²⁴, before the time of Herodotus; Megara pretended to have conferred it upon no one but Hercules²⁵, before Alexander the Great's time; others were liberal with it, as Sybaris²⁶, and, upon the faith of an uncertain statement, Athens²⁷. However, that liberality in dispensing the franchise in general, could not be a political maxim amongst the Greeks, will perhaps result from the following reflections. Naturalisation might, it is true,

²¹ Comp. Meier de Bon. Damnator. p. 73.

²² See, on the subject of Byzantium, the city thronged with strangers, Ps. Aristot. Oec. 2. 3.

²³ The naturalised alien: Δημοποιητός, κατὰ ψήφισμα πολίτης. Demosth. c. Nicostr. 1252; Ps. Demosth. in Neær. 1345.

²⁴ Herod. 9. 33; comp. Paus. 3. 11. 6.

²⁵ Plut. Præcepé. Gerend. Reipub. 9. 286.

²⁶ Diod. 12. 9.

²⁷ Phot. and Suid. Περιβοῖσαι from Ephorus.

appear admissible, and even advisable, in those places where there was a scanty population, as in the infancy of various new communities; however, the Grecian states by no means exhibited the desire to possess a large population. From the separation prevailing amongst them, and the favour of circumstances, which secured independence to numerically inconsiderable communities, as well as from the absence of projects of aggrandisement in those quarters, where a hegemony was able to call into action considerable bodies, they required but a moderate proportion of physical force to maintain a proper position, with regard to the neighbouring states; against more immediate danger they contracted alliances, or yielded to superior force, without any disposition to employ extensive numbers for their defence. On the other hand, the estimation of the citizenship was rather directed to its intrinsic essence; an opinion soon began to prevail, that the citizen ought to be possessed of a suitable qualification as regarded property, that the free exercise of rights on his part might not be impeded by a redundant population, and that it was necessary to preclude any disproportion between the number of the estates and that of the proprietors. Add to this their incapacity to govern larger masses, the notion that the state ought to be a symmetrical whole, and the prevailing disposition in favour of political machinery, which might be conveniently overlooked; and lastly, an opinion that it was highly salutary when the citizens in general were acquainted with each other, and lived upon a familiar footing²³.

²³ Plat. de Legg. 5. 738. C. E.; Aristot. Pol. 5. 9. 2; conf. 7. 4. 8.

This, it is true, seems to be at variance with the solicitude displayed for the maintenance of families, the obligation of the magistrates to prevent the extinction of a house²⁹, and the orders for enforcing marriage³⁰; but this was not directed to the general principle of population, but resulted from that primitive religious feeling which regarded as sacred the perpetuation of existing families. It was a subject of affliction to an individual to have no issue; and the extinction of a family was deplored by the state as a public calamity. With this was connected the purely political consideration that certain duties appertained to certain families. On the other hand, the disposition to observe a fixed limit in the number of the citizens, is proved by the fact that, except in Sparta and Locri³¹, it was lawful for them to leave the country³², that the exposition of children was almost universally permitted³³, and particularly that the number of citizens sent out to colonies, was far greater than that of strangers adopted by naturalization. This must be combined with the bounty of nature towards the rising states, and the rapid increase in population, so that upon the lowest possible computation the total numerical amount of Grecian citizens must have been almost incredible. Finally, when war or other causes rendered an increase in the number of citizens necessary, it was a more obvious expedient to have recourse in the emergency to *Periœci*, or to individuals selected

²⁹ Demosth. adv. Macar. 1076; comp. Pol. 3. 89; Isæus de Apollod. Heredit. 179.

³⁰ Deinarch. c. Demosth. 51; Plut. Lyc. 15.

³¹ Plut. Lyc. 27; Stob. Serm. 42. 279. Orl.

³² Concerning Athens, see Plat. Criton, 51. D.

³³ Thebes formed an exception, *Æl. V. H.* 2. 7.

from the servile class at home, than to strangers; this is even proved by the fabulous accounts of the Spartan Epeunactæ³⁴ and the Chalcedonian Metœci³⁵.

After the distinction between citizenship and slavery, and alienage, has exhibited in a clear light the exclusive nature of the first, we may enumerate the following as its leading ingredients: The right of pleading before public tribunals; that of possessing landed property, whereas the alien could only be a tenant³⁶; and the right of bearing arms, and taking part in the proceedings of the popular assembly. To guarantee the same, it was necessary that the natural-born citizen should be recognised as a member by one of the Phylæ, Phratriæ, or other unions adverted to above, and that the naturalized alien should have derived his right from a decree of the collective people, emanating from the centre of the state. It could only be forfeited by the criminal through the operation of a judicial sentence, guaranteed by the body of the people. It was designated by the word honour (*τιμή*)³⁷, which, together with the right itself, became extended, from its original reference to the privileges of the nobility³⁸ to general citizenship; the privation of the same, as a state of infamy, was entitled (*ἀτιμία*)³⁹.

³⁴ Theop. ap. Ath. 6. 271. C.

³⁵ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 208.

³⁶ Xenoph. de Vectig. 2. 6; Boeckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 154.

³⁷ Poll. 4. 5. 9.

³⁸ Thus applied to magistrates, Herod. 1. 59; comp. Sophocl. Aj. 661; Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 2; 6. 5. 11; hence *τιμοῦχοι* in Massilia, Strab. 4. 179.

³⁹ Conf. § 46.

V. THE CONDITION OF SLAVES AND ALIENS AS
OPPOSED TO CITIZENSHIP.

§ 34. Servitude was of two kinds—bondage and slavery.

Bondage arose in consequence of the migrations from the subjugation of the inhabitants of a district by invading hordes. This was, according to circumstances, attended either by force or treaty; the former expelled or subjected; the latter admitted gradations in servitude, by which means certain personal rights might be preserved; however, even after treaties, instances of the exercise of force were by no means rare. Thus, then, there was in their condition a continual tendency to servitude, in consequence of the ineffectual struggles of those originally but partially enslaved, to recover their former freedom, and the growing appetite for power in their new masters; as when the Spartans reduced the Messenians to bondage, men sprung from a common stock with themselves, and once possessed of equal rights. In the explanations of the words *Helot* and *Penestes*, it is laid down as their inseparable incidents, that bondsmen of this description should have been subdued by force of arms¹, and that they should all have been slaves by birth²; this involved the formal distinction between them and the purchased slaves of barbarian origin,

¹ Harpocr. and thence Suid. *είλωτεύειν*. *Είλωτες γάρ οἱ μὴ γόνυ δοῦλοι Λακεδαιμονίων, ἀλλ' οἱ πρῶτοι χειρωθέντες*, Athen. 6. 264. A.; *πενέστας τοὺς μὴ γόνυ δούλους, διὰ πόλεμον δ' ἡλωκότας*. To the same effect are more or less fully, Hesych. *Πενέσται*, Etym. M. *Είλωτες, είλωτεύειν*, Ammon. *πελαστής*, Heracl. Pont. 2. A corresponding derivation of the word *Είλωτες* is from *είλον*; conf. Müll. Dor. 2. 34; and against Göttling's notes to Aristot. Pol. 465; Müll. Proleg. 428; and the interpretation of *πενέστης* by *Λάτρις*, see n. 15.

² See the preceding note.

with the assertion of the principle, the growth of a later age indeed, that the barbarians were, in consequence of their difference of race, destined by nature to serve the Greeks³. For this reason, and because the treatment of the bondsmen was less severe than that of the purchased slaves, the former are frequently placed a grade higher, and described as an intermediate class between freemen and slaves⁴. There is no common denomination for them, which, at the same time, expresses the distinction between their condition and slavery⁵. The Helots of Laconia and the Penestæ of Thessaly, are adduced as examples in the ancient commentators, and those belonging to other districts, and differently named, compared with them⁶. Their collective condition presents certain uniform features; they were natives of the province in which they served, pursued agricultural and other manual occupations, paid tribute, and in dress and demeanour bore the stamp of servitude. Occasional deviations from this rule were found in single districts.

The Thessalian Penestæ and the Maryandini of Heraclea are distinguished from the others by positive agreements, regulating the servile footing on which they stood; wherefore Plato might probably allude to their condition as more easy to be determined than that of the Helots⁷. Subjugated by the Thessalians, the dwellers around Arne⁸, from

³ Aristot. Pol. 1. 2. 18. 19.

⁴ Poll. 3. 83; μεταξύ δὲ ἐλευθέρων καὶ δούλων οἱ Λακεδαιμονίων Ἐίλωτες καὶ Θετταλῶν Πενέσται.

⁵ Thucyd. 5. 23. the Helots are called ἡ δουλεία. Photius, Πενέσται οἱ τῶν Θετταλῶν δοῦλοι.

⁶ Poll. 3. 83; Harpocr. Πενέσται; Phot. Πενέσται and Κλαρωται; Etym. Gud. Είλωτες; Eustath. Il. 16. 1090. 48, sqq. R.; comp. Athen. 6. 263, D. sqq.

⁷ De Legg. 6. 776. D.

⁸ Archemæthus, His. Eub. ap. Ath. 6. 264. B.

the stock of the Bœotians, were reduced to bondage, as well as the Perrhebian and Magnes, according to Theopompus⁹, who, in all probability, alludes to single communities amongst them¹⁰, whilst the main tribes maintained themselves as the tributary nations described above¹¹. The former surrendered to the Thessalians, and engaged to till their lands, but without acknowledging a right in their masters to kill or sell them out of the country¹². As men reduced in war they were called Latreis¹³; as belonging to the state, and not the domestic slaves of individuals, Thettaloiketæ¹⁴; from their remaining in the country, Menestæ; from the indigence of servitude, Penestæ¹⁵. Their frequent insurrections may have from time to time aggravated the oppression under which they suffered: after the Persian war Scopas regulated their tribute¹⁶. It is not improbable that a species of bondsmen allied to them were the Cylicranes, in the vicinity of Heraclea in Trachis, said to have come originally from Lydia, and to have derived their name from the mark of a drinking cup, branded on one of their shoulders¹⁷. A similar treaty was concluded with the Heracleots on the Pontus by the Bithynian Maryandinians, and from the tribute which they paid afterwards named gift-bearers, (δωροφόροι)¹⁸.

⁹ Athen. 6. 265. C.¹⁰ Strab. 9. 440.¹¹ § 26. n. 37.¹² Archemach. ubi sup. and thence Suid. Πενέσται.¹³ Eurip. ap. Ath. 6. 264.: Λάτρεις Πενέσται; Hesych. Πενέσται — τινὲς δὲ Λάτρεις ἢ ἐργάται πένητες ἢ ὑπὴκοοι. Comp. Ammon. Θῆς — Λάτρεις ὁ κατὰ πολεμικὴν περίστασιν ἀλούς καὶ ἐπὶ δουλείαν προσαχθείς. Thus Pindar Nem. 4. 88. says λατρίαν Ἰαωλκόν, subdued by force of arms.¹⁴ Pherecrat. His. Thess. ap. Ath. 6. 264. A.; Eustath. ubi sup. (see n. 6.)¹⁵ Archemach. and Eustath. ubi sup. Suid. Πενέσται. The absurd derivation from a certain Penestus was alluded to above. See § 12. n. 20.¹⁶ Xenoph. Hell. 6. 1. 19.¹⁷ Polemon, apud Ath. 11. 426. A.¹⁸ Callistrat. ap. Ath. 6. 263. E; Strab. 12. 542; Poll. 3. 83; Hesych. δωροφόρους. Phot. Κλαρῶται. Eustath. ubi sup. 53, sqq.

The most remote from express conventional stipulation, as to duties and rights, was the servitude of the Helots¹⁹. In Crete, Lyctus and the other considerable towns, possessed, besides the Perioeci, two other sorts of bondsmen, viz. the Mnoitæ, belonging to the state, and Aphamiotæ or Clarotæ²⁰, who were the agricultural labourers of the individual land-holders. The latter name expresses the idea of subjugation, and the division of the tillage land into lots, to which the former proprietors were attached in the capacity of serfs²¹. Little more than the name is known of the bondsmen belonging to other states. To this class belonged the Gymnesii in Argos²², so called from their want of military attire, the Callicyrians in Syracuse²³, the Bithyni in Byzantium²⁴, the Thebageneis in Bœotia²⁵, and the so called Pelæsgians amongst the Italiots²⁶.

A relation which requires separate consideration is that of the slaves of the temple called Craugallidæ and Hieroduli²⁷. The instrumentality of

¹⁹ See below, § 42.

²⁰ See in particular, Sosicrat. ap. Ath. 6. 263. F; Eustath. Il. 15. 1024. 35, sqq.; (ub. Ἀφαμιῶται): comp. Athen. 6. 267. C.; Hesych. μνοία, μνῶα, μνῶται, Poll. 3. 83; Strab. 12. 542; Μινῶα σύνοδος, (comp. Götting ad Aristot. Pol. 473); Steph. Byz. Χίος, ub. δμῶται; Hesych. ἀφαμιῶται, ἀφημιᾶσους, ἀφημιῶντας, (Küster, in reference to ἐφημίαι, says that ἀφημίαι signifies fields), Hesych. and Phot. κλαρῶται, Etym. M. Πενέσται; Strab. 15. 701. According to Eustath. Il. 16. 1090. 48. the word θεράποντες was also in use.

²¹ Ath. 6. 263. E.: Καλοῦσι δὲ οἱ Κρήτες — Ἀφαμιῶτας τοὺς κατ' ἀγρὸν, ἐγχωρίους μὲν ὄντας, δουλωθέντας δὲ κατὰ πόλεμον διὰ τὸ κληρωθῆναι κλαρῶτας.

²² Poll. 3. 82; Steph. Byz. Χίος. Etym. Gud. Ἐλῶτες; comp. § 30. n. 69.

²³ Herod. 7. 155; Poll. 3. 83; Phot. Καλλικύρ. and κιλλικύρ. Suid. etc. Comp. Tittm. Gr. Staatsv. 503. n. 80; Müll. Dor. 2. 62. n. 1.

²⁴ Phylarch. ap. Ath. 6. 271. C.; Zenob. 4. 54.

²⁵ Ammon. Θηβαῖοι. Comp. Müller, Orchom. 387. 388. and his article Bœotia in Ersch. u. Grub. Encyclop. p. 263.

²⁶ Steph. Byz. Χίος.

²⁷ See Creuzer, Symb. 1. 251; Kreuser der Hellenen Priesterstaat and Adrian die Priesterinnen d. Gr. Müller, Dor. 1. 42. 43. 254. 258.

the Delphic god in sending out colonies has been already adverted to²⁸; it was in very early ages the custom to send out men for his service; their object was, in most instances indeed, the foundation of colonies, and, as examples, are adduced the Magnetes on the Mæander²⁹, and the Dryopians in the Peloponnesus³⁰; but those descendants of the Dryopian stock that inhabited the country around the Phocian Cirrha, Craugallion, thence called Craugallidæ³¹, must be considered as bondsmen. The Hieroduli³² who served in the Corinthian temples can only have been purchased slaves; one town in Crete, inhabited by Hieroduli, is only known to us from suspicious authorities³³; it appears to have been of an oriental character³⁴: we have already alluded to the causes³⁵ which led to the introduction of purchased slaves. The citizen of Greece, in nearly all the provinces of that country, sooner or later raised himself above the level of the mechanic; and it henceforward became a national principle, that it was requisite that there should be a class subordinate to the free citizens of the various communities, whose duty it was to relieve them from the necessity of pursuing laborious occupations, and providing the common necessities of life. A class like this could not always

²⁸ § 22. n. 73.²⁹ Athen. 4. 173. E.³⁰ Paus. 4. 36. 6; Müller, Dor. 1. 42.³¹ Harpocr. Κραυγαλλίδαι, Müller, ubi sup.³² Strab. 8. 378.³³ Sosicrat. ap. Suid. 1. 621; Comp. Hesych. δοῦλων πόλις. Vatic. app. 2. 94; Steph. Byz. δοῦλων πόλις calls it χιλίανδρος.³⁴ Οἰκέται ἀνδράποδα, were perhaps peculiar designations; Ammon, οἰκό-τριψ — οἰκέτης — ὁ δοῦλος ὁ ὠνητός. The signification of Δοῦλος is more extensive, Ammon, δοῦλοι, comp. above § 34. n. 5. Θεράπων, διάκονος, ὑπηρέτης, πρόσπολος, etc. (See Chrysipp. ap. Ath. 6. 267. B. sqq.; Eustath. 11. 15. 1024. 35, sqq.; comp. Kreuser der Hellen. Priesters. 150, sqq.) refer to the nature of the service and not to the class.³⁵ § 33.

be formed out of the subdued natives: it was consequently necessary to supply the deficiency from other quarters, as was effected in modern times in Spanish America, after the extermination of the native tribes. Now it cannot be denied that war had produced prisoners as early as the heroic age, and the Phœnician traders had offered slaves for sale³⁶; however, it was an invariable usage in Grecian warfare to deliver up Greek prisoners for a ransom³⁷; the slave-trade was accordingly exclusively directed to the barbarians. Chios is said to have been the first state which carried on a trade in slaves³⁸, that is to say, which itself first rendered the purchase of slaves in barbarian countries³⁹ an object of active commerce. Hence resulted the principle, that it was necessary for the purchased slave to be a barbarian, and the accompanying notion, which was afterwards more fully developed⁴⁰, that the barbarian was by nature marked out for slavery, and deficient in such qualities as were essential to the character of political citizenship, which is closely allied with the remarkable designation of the native seats of the slaves, as countries or districts only, and their consequent appellation of *Patriotæ*⁴¹. For that reason the purchased slave could nowhere obtain admittance to the rights of citizenship, and never, as in Rome, by

³⁶ § 16. n. 8. 9.

³⁷ § 27. n. 10.

³⁸ Theop. ap. Ath. 6. 265. B. sqq.; comp. Steph. Byz. *Χίος*.

³⁹ The essential words in Ath. *ubi sup.* are *βαρβάρους κέκτηνται τοὺς οἰκίας*.

⁴⁰ Comp. § 28.

⁴¹ Ammon. *πολίτης* — ὁ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἐλεύθερος ἐλευθέριον πατριώτης — ὁ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς χώρας δούλος δούλον. Hesych. *πατριώτης παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις ὁ βάρβαρος καὶ οὐ πολίτης*. Comp. Photius, *πατριῶται*, and Poll. 3. 54. As there were slaves, so there were *ἵπποι πατριῶται*, Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 2. 2. 26.

mere manumission on the part of his master. To be a Greek, except at Delphi, where all nations were admitted, was an indispensable condition for the enjoyment of civil rights. Such purchased slaves as were manumitted entered into the rights of the *Metœci*. Thus the Greeks preserved their internal political system pure from all admixture of barbarian nations, and this is most probably one of the causes of the strength and originality evinced by their national character, whereas the Romans united various and dissimilar ingredients by means of form only, and, although the union was as perfect as the discordance of the combining parts would allow, they were still obliged to have the nobler fruits of intellectual culture imperfectly engrafted upon the native stock from external sources. The treatment of the slaves as such, except so far as regarded the difference between slaves of the state, (*δοῦλοι τοῦ κοινοῦ*), and those of individuals, was dependent upon private law and moral feeling, and does not come within the scope of our present investigation; the same remark holds good of the proportion their number bore to that of the citizens, which is a question of political economy, and wholly unconnected with political law.

The notion of foreigner, considered in a political point of view, that is to say, as implying a person not belonging to the state, might be taken in a more or less extended acceptation, according to the constitution of the state, whether simple or complicated, by federal relations or Hegemony: however, in confederacies, the individual communities were usually so exclusive, that when there was no positive provision for an interchange of civil rights,

the distinction of the foreign character was never abolished amongst them; but Hegemony could only produce an effect of this kind by compulsory means, and in such cases the preponderance of a powerful state may generally be perceived. Hospitality produced no more than a civilised and friendly connection, but no fixed rule of political rights. In general, the condition of the political alien was one of mere sufferance. Foreigners grew more closely connected with the state by becoming resident in it, as *Metœci*; but more in the obligations they incurred than the rights they acquired: the relation in which they stood was lower than *Xenia*, without the gratification of reciprocity, and the respect which is shown to a guest, who may himself be a host. Their *Prostates* was not a hospitable friend, but a person placed in authority over them, and their only advantage was that of a permanent asylum. The *Isoteles* in Athens were nearly upon a level with the citizens, at least with regard to taxation; however, this relation did not attain maturity till afterwards. Upon the whole, exact particulars are known of the Athenian *Metœci* only, and, therefore, this subject cannot be considered in detail till afterwards.

ARISTOCRACY (TIMOCRACY) AND DEMOCRACY IN DIFFERENT STATES.

1. THE GOVERNING CLASS.

§ 35. The preceding chapter contains a general outline of the different classes which existed under the more ancient constitutions of Greece. Before the nature of the constitutions themselves can be satisfactorily investigated, it is necessary to ascertain in which class in the several states the supreme power resided.

In Corinth, and in the other states of Doric extraction which follow, it was vested in the nobility.

This continued to be the case in Corinth as long as it was governed by the Bacchiadæ¹; it was not till the tyranny of the Cypselidæ (Olymp. 30. 3—49. 3)², that there arose a timocracy, which seems to have been essentially founded upon the principle of valuation, in which, though noble houses like the Oligæthidæ³ still subsisted, the people possessed more extensive rights than before⁴.

In the Corinthian colony, Leucas, the power of the nobility was based upon the inalienability of property, with the cessation of which the Demus⁵ arose; in Apollonia noble houses⁶, exercising Xenelasia⁷, and preserving good order⁸, maintained themselves till a very late age; in Syracuse the

¹ Herod. 5. 92; Paus. 2. 4. 4.

² Comp. § 49. n. 7—10.

³ Pind. Ol. 13. 2, sqq., 137.

⁴ This may be collected from Sosicles the Corinthian's description of the government of the Bacchiadæ (Herod. 5. 92. 2.)

⁵ Aristot. Pol. 2. 4. 4.

⁶ Herod. 9. 93; Aristot. Pol. 4. 3. 8.

⁷ Æl. V. H. 13. 15.

⁸ Strab. 7. 316.

Demus expelled the Gamori a short time before the Persian war, and then both fell under the tyranny of Gelon⁹; in the Corinthian-Corcyraean colony of Epidamnus, the hereditary nobility of the Phylarchs governed till a short time before the Peloponnesian war¹⁰.

In Epidaurus, the noble council of 180 members¹¹ seems gradually, and in process of time, to have placed the country-people, the Conipodes¹², upon a more respectable footing, as concerned civil rights; the continuance of the aristocracy is, however, implied by their firm attachment to Sparta. The same may be observed of Hermione, Trœzen, the Halieis, and Phlius.

Ægina was governed by nobility, like its parent city, Epidaurus¹³; it was in vain that Nicodromus, towards the time of the Persian wars, excited the Demus to insurrection; eight hundred of his partisans were butchered by the victorious nobility¹⁴.

In Ialysus, on the island of Rhodes, the Eratidæ were renowned and powerful¹⁵. The authority of the nobility here, as well as in Lindus and Camirus, most probably derived a milder character from the civil polity¹⁶ introduced into it by the Lindian Cleobulus.

The government of the Rhodian colony, Gela, was likewise, first of all, aristocratic¹⁷; it was soon (Olymp. 68. 4.) followed by the tyranny of Cleander¹⁸; Gela's colony, Agrigentum, in the fortieth year after its foundation (Olymp. 53. 4.), in conse-

⁹ Herod. 7. 155, sqq.

¹⁰ Aristot. Pol. 3. 4. 1; 5. 1. 6; 5. 3. 4.

¹¹ Plut. Qu. Gr. n. 1.

¹² See above, § 32, n. 19.

¹³ See Append. vii.; conf. Müller, Æginet. 133, sqq.

¹⁴ Herod. 6. 91.

¹⁵ § 30, n. 11.

¹⁶ See below, § 41, n. 24.

¹⁷ Aristot. Pol. 5. 10. 4.

¹⁸ Herod. 7. 153; conf. § 49, n. 60.

quence of timocracy¹⁹, fell under the tyranny of Phalaris.

In Cnidus, sixty nobles formed a council, of which they were members for life, and were irresponsible for their decrees.

In Crete²⁰, after the termination of the heroic age, Cosmi, descended from noble families²¹, had replaced the princes; the noble council, the Geronia, was composed of the Cosmi who had quitted office²²; but it frequently happened that when these last were unwilling to resign their powers, factions ensued, and led to the notorious Acosmia²³.

Noble houses of Messenian origin²⁴ governed in Rhegium, till the tyranny of Anaxilas.

The subject of Sparta will be treated in the chapter concerning the codes of the various legislators.

The Ætolian-Doric Elis was governed by ninety nobles, who were elected in the manner of the Spartan Gerontes, and for life, but dynastically²⁵, consequently according to the privileges of a dominant class. At a later period, a Bule of six hundred persons²⁶ was added to it from a more extensive circle of nobility. It was unlawful to mortgage landed property²⁷. This ancient aristocratic institute was ascribed to Oxylyus.

A no less close system of aristocratic government prevailed in the Æolic states.

In Thebes, according to an ancient law, no one

¹⁹ Aristot. Pol. 5. 8. 4; conf. § 49, n. 51.

²⁰ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 171; conf. Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 11.

²¹ Aristot. Pol. 2. 7. 5.

²² Ibid. and Strab. 10. 484.

²³ Aristot. Pol. 2. 7. 7; conf. Göttling ad Aristot. p. 476.

²⁴ Ibid. 5. 10. 4; Strab. 6. 257.

²⁵ Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 8. *δυναστευτικήν* is the correct word, as it serves to express the precise difference between their mode of election and that in Sparta, to which it in other respects bore resemblance.

²⁶ Thucyd. 5. 47.

²⁷ Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 5.

was allowed to participate in the government who had not ceased to carry on trade in the market for ten years²⁸. This in itself does not, indeed, breathe the spirit of a narrowly-circumscribed order; but towards the time of the Persian war, Thebes groaned under dynasts²⁹. In Thespiæ the supreme power³⁰ resided in Demuchi, belonging to the house of the Thespiadæ; in Orchomenus, in the knights³¹, who retained their power till the age of Epaminondas.

Mitylene, the capital of Lesbos, was governed by the Penthilidæ; but upon their parading the streets armed with clubs, and committing unbridled outrages, they perished through the efforts of Megacles³². But dynasts once more stirred up the fury of civil contests, and order and tranquillity were not restored before the freely elected sovereignty (Æsymnety) of Pittacus³³.

Ancient nobility governed in Cuma; the Basileus was compelled to stand at the bar of their tribunal³⁴; Phidon introduced the census, but at what time does not appear; whoever could keep a horse was entitled to take part in the government³⁵. Likewise in Magnesia, on the Mæander, the knights possessed the chief power³⁶.

It was the same case with Minyan-Doric nobility in Thera³⁷; in Cyrene it led to monarchy, with which, after violent commotions, Demonax, the

²⁸ Aristot. Pol. 3. 3. 4.

²⁹ Thucyd. 3. 62; Paus. 9. 6. 1. The Thebans, in the passage of Thucydides referred to above, call this *ὁ πᾶτριον*.

³⁰ Diod. 4. 29; conf. § 30, n. 14.

³¹ Diod. 15. 79.

³² Aristot. Pol. 5. 8. 13.

³³ Ibid. 3. 9. 5; Strab. 13. 617; Diog. Laert. 1. 74.

³⁴ Plut. Qu. Gr. n. 4. 7. 172. R.

³⁵ Heracl. Pont. 11; conf. § 31, n. 10.

³⁶ Aristot. Pol. 4. 3. 2.

³⁷ Ibid. 4. 3. 8.

Mantinean, attempted to unite democratic institutions³⁸, but his work was never consolidated.

Cyprus, a state which can hardly be considered Grecian, was always governed by dynasts of the oriental character.

Amongst the Ionic states, nobility chiefly predominated in Athens, the subject of which will afterwards be treated in detail. In Ephesus, affairs were managed by a noble council, with civic deputies³⁹. There seems to have been no popular assembly whatever. The government of the Basilidæ in Erythræ was apparently of a similar nature. The former was precipitated by the tyrant Pythagoras⁴⁰, and the Demus rose against the latter⁴¹. The wealthy class governed in Colophon; but their number was greater than that of the rest of the citizens: from the moment that Gyges took the town, the constitution was destroyed⁴². In Samos, after the murder of the autocrat Damoteles, the Geomori composed the dominant class; but dissension raged between them and the people; the commanders of an auxiliary fleet, sent to aid the Perinthians led the ships' crews and the captive Megarians⁴³ against them; but liberty once more succumbed to the tyranny of Polycrates. A governing nobility maintained their footing longer in Chios⁴⁴. The aristocratic government of Phocæa can only be recalled by the re-appearance of Masilia in history; in the latter, the circle of the nobility was, for a considerable time, rigorously

³⁸ See below, § 41, n. 35.

³⁹ Strab. 14. 640; conf. § 37, n. 16.

⁴⁰ See § 49, n. 34.

⁴¹ Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 4.

⁴² Ibid. 4. 3. 8; conf. Herod. 1. 14, and Xenophanes ap. Ath. 12. 526.

⁴³ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 211. 212; compare below § 49, n. 38.

⁴⁴ Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 11.

closed, and even after the other portion of the wealthy class had gained admission to their ranks, they maintained themselves with calmness and dignity⁴⁵.

Nobility governed in Naxos, till the daughters of a rich countryman were violated by two libertines, whereupon Lygdamis incited the people to tumult, and from a demagogue made himself tyrant⁴⁶.

In Eubœa, Chalcis was under the authority of lordly Hippobotæ, till these yielded to the youthful Demus of Athens⁴⁷; in Eretria, the Hippobotæ retained their power till Diagoras led the people against them⁴⁸ after the Persian war. The Chalcidian colonies, the Italian Cuma⁴⁹, and Sicilian Leontini⁵⁰, were originally subject to the power of nobility; in the former place it was subverted by the demagogue Aristodemus; in the latter, it led to the tyranny of Panætius, and afterwards to protracted civil feuds. No exact particulars have been transmitted concerning the remainder of the Chalcidian towns in the vicinity of Leontini, and Chalcidice in Thrace; the laws of Charondas in the former⁵¹, and those of Andromadas in the latter⁵², can hardly have regulated the orders.

Amongst the Achæan colonies, Sybaris had a numerous monied aristocracy, which was, however, so far exclusive in its character, that the Demagogy of Telys could be asserted against it⁵³. Crotona's magistrates were not held responsible⁵⁴, and, there-

⁴⁵ Ibid. 5. 5. 2; Strab. 4. 179.

⁴⁶ Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 1, and Aristot. ap. Ath. 8. 348; comp. Herod. 5. 30.

⁴⁷ Herod. 5. 77; comp. Append. xiii.

⁴⁸ Aristot. Pol. 5. 5. 10.

⁴⁹ Dion. H. 7. 4, sqq.

⁵⁰ Aristot. Pol. 5. 10. 4.

⁵¹ Ibid. 2. 9. 5.

⁵² Ibid. 2. 9. 9.

⁵³ Diod. 12. 9. Compare, on the destruction of the town through dissension, Steph. Byz. Σύβαρις.

⁵⁴ Jamblich. in Vit. Pythag. 257.

fore, probably proceeded from an aristocracy. Here, and in several of the neighbouring towns, the ideal theory of an aristocracy of the virtuous, who ruled the state by force of the moral law inherent in them, was for a short time realised⁵⁵ by Pythagoras. The massacre of the Pythagoreans was succeeded by anarchy, till Achæan ambassadors regulated the orders upon the same system as those of the mother-state⁵⁶.

In Thessaly, not only the Penestæ, but likewise the Demus groaned under oppression. Commotions⁵⁷ becoming frequent, the Aleuadæ united themselves to Xerxes, the Thessalians were desirous of joining the Greeks⁵⁸; but even after the Persian wars popular liberty could not flourish.

In Delphi, as a separate state, and distinct from Phocis, there reigned a nobility of remote antiquity, called the Deucalionidæ⁵⁹; at their head were five persons denominated the *Consecrated*⁶⁰, who superintended the service of the oracle⁶¹, and apparently presided over the criminal tribunal⁶².

Less rigorously connected with the family principle, and at the same time endangered by the ambitious efforts of the Demus, was the aristocracy in several states of the Doric race.

In Argos there was a council of eighty men, over which Artynæ presided; in addition to this a Bule⁶³, which is an evidence of the growth of the

⁵⁵ Diog. Laert. 8. 3.—περὶ τοὺς τριηκοσίους ὄντες (οἱ Πυθαγόρ.) ᾤκονόμουν ἀριστα τὰ πολιτικά ὥστε σχεδὸν ἀριστοκρατίαν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν.

⁵⁶ Polyb. 2. 39. 1.

⁵⁷ Herod. 7. 6. and 172.

⁵⁸ Diod. 11. 2; comp. Herod. 7. 172—174.

⁵⁹ Ἀριστεῖς, Eurip. Ion. 428; comp. § 30. n. 22.

⁶⁰ Ὀσίοι, Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 174.

⁶¹ Eurip. ubi sup.

⁶² Ibid. 1236.

⁶³ Thucyd. 5. 47.

Demus; the power of the latter was consummated by the naturalisation of the Periœci, after the loss of four thousand ancient citizens through Cleomenes⁶⁴. Sicyon's reputed purely Doric aristocracy⁶⁵ must not be looked upon as a constitution of the early age; it was not framed by Sparta till the Peloponnesian war. The original constitution, of which nothing determinate is known, soon yielded to the tyranny of the Orthagoridæ⁶⁶, about Ol. 27. After this the people rose in the scale of things, so that Sparta was subsequently compelled to limit their power. Megara, at first probably governed by Bacchiadæ, sent thither by Corinth, grew rich, and vernal by threw off the allegiance to the mother-state; the wealthy inhabitants were overthrown by Theagenes the tyrant⁶⁷; after him Megara was disgraced by the most reckless ochlocracy, which, amidst ostracism, palintocia, and a flagitious violation of the law of nations, bore itself with the most ridiculous arrogance⁶⁸. Its colonies Byzantium and Chalcedon, destitute of families of ancient and noble descent, soon allowed riches and trade to thrive, when the lower class of people also rose higher. The oligarchy in Byzantium, which Thra-sybulus overthrew⁶⁹, had been established there but a short time before by Sparta. Corcyra, founded by the Heraclid Chersicrates⁷⁰, may, in the first instance, like the mother-city and its remaining colonies, have been subject to an aristocracy; but that this did not consist of Bacchiadæ

⁶⁴ Aristot. Pol. 5. 2. 8; Herod. 6. 78. sqq.; comp. § 32. n. 12.

⁶⁵ "Ἀκρατος καὶ Δωρικὴ ἀριστοκρατία. Plut. Arat. 2.

⁶⁶ See § 49. n. 1.

⁶⁷ Arist. Pol. 5. 4. 5; comp. § 49. n. 16.

⁶⁸ See § 15. n. 68.

⁶⁹ Xenoph. Hell. 4. 8. 27; Diod. 14. 12.

⁷⁰ Strab. 6. 269.

may be inferred from the sea-fight with the Corinthians⁷¹, a short time before the tyranny of Cypselus (Ol. 28.) But Corcyra undoubtedly fell under the tyranny of the Cypselidæ⁷². This loosened all the ancient bonds, and it was succeeded by the predominance of a turbulent demus opposed to the wealthy class. Tarentum must, from the attention it devoted to maritime trade, have had an aspiring demus at a very early period; but this was kept in check by the rich men and the nobles, so that Aristotle⁷³ calls the constitution a Politeia; it was in vain that the Pythagoreans attempted to remove its defects⁷⁴.

Amongst the Ionian states, Miletus presents the spectacle of impetuous efforts on the part of the demus to make head against the aristocracy, which, after the kings⁷⁵ Thoas and Damasenor, took possession of the government; protracted collisions between the former, called the Cheiromacha, and the latter the Plontis or the Aeinautæ⁷⁶, alternated with tyranny. Abydos and Cyzicus, the colonies of Miletus, perhaps like that city, gradually assumed a democratic character.

It is not till after the Persian war that historical light falls upon the Pontic states. It is, however, recorded of Heraclea on the Pontus, that the demus prevailed at its foundation, but that a vicious demagogy very soon brought on oligarchy⁷⁷.

Achaia, held up by Polybius as a model of the democratic constitution⁷⁸, seems likewise, at the time when the princely power terminated, to have

⁷¹ Thuc. 1. 13.

⁷² Herod. 3. 49. sqq.

⁷³ Pol. 5. 2. 8.

⁷⁴ Diog. Laert. 8. 40.

⁷⁵ This is the construction which I put upon *τυράννων*. Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 193, as in the case of the Argive Phidon. Comp. § 49. n. 30.

⁷⁶ § 31. n. 8.

⁷⁷ Aristot. Pol. 5. 4. 3.

⁷⁸ Ibid. 2. 38. 6.

had no government of nobility; with steady pace the Achæans advanced on their ancient path, till, in the Peloponnesian war, Sparta's influence succeeded in disengaging Pellene from their connection.

The demus probably stood much higher in Arcadia. Tegea's attachment to Sparta, in the age before the Persian wars, does not prove the predominance of an aristocracy; it is probable that the bravest warrior enjoyed the highest consideration, but without any invidious reaction on a servile class; even Pericæci cannot be traced with certainty. The mention made of a female dynast, called Perimede or Choira, at the time of the wars with Sparta⁷⁹, bears a somewhat enigmatical appearance. The legislators enumerated by Pausanias⁸⁰, probably belonged to a later age. Mantinea's democratic confederacy with the inhabitants of the surrounding district, which strengthened itself by their union into one capital⁸¹, was copied in the Cyrenæan institutions of Demonax. It is a remarkable fact, that the mass of the people had a share in the council, but the magistracy were chosen by select citizens⁸². A similar spectacle, with still greater simplicity of the rural character, is presented in the other states of Arcadia.

To these must be added the following races, governed by veterans as well as able-bodied warriors, selected from amongst them respectively:—the Malians⁸³, the Acarnanians, the Locrians, and Ætolians; and lastly, in all probability, the Dorians and Phocians.

⁷⁹ See § 49, n. 25.

⁸⁰ Paus. 8. 48. 1.

⁸¹ § 21, n. 8.

⁸² Aristot. Pol. 6. 2. 2.

⁸³ See § 37, n. 2.

II. THE ANCIENT ARISTOCRACY GENERALLY IN ITS RELATION TO THE DEMUS AND THE SUBSEQUENT OLIGARCHY.

§ 36. It has been more than once remarked, that the words aristocracy, oligarchy, and democracy, as the signs of various constitutions, have a dubious and fluctuating import which will not bear the test of close examination. This may be very true as regards the philosophical method of considering these terms; but if we confine our attention to the aristocracy of the earlier ages of Greece, we are naturally led to enquire whether that mode of government ought not to be accounted something more than an unnatural and temporary state of things, and rather be looked upon as the natural product of the age, and whether it was not considered in the same light by the Greeks themselves. In this enquiry it is not necessary to recur to the ultimate grounds of natural law; we must examine the Grecian political system itself, as exhibited in history, and upon this the following arguments are founded.

If, then, aristocracy is to be considered a mere departure from an original democracy, it would be possible to trace the existence of the latter in the heroic age: but this is disproved by the foregoing exposition. Or a constitution must, in the earliest stages of political development, have established popular government: but custom was, with few exceptions, characteristic of the age. In the migrations, indeed, there arose various kinds of treaty between the leaders and the hordes, and between the original inhabitants of a district and

the new-comers: but, again, the founders of the new states sometimes continued the prescription of the mother-country¹; the aristocracy in the greater portion of them assumed the form of an hereditary nobility; the *demus* rather retrograded than advanced, and was far from occupying a legally-recognised position, from which it might, as a legitimate order, have concluded treaties with the nobility as to its rank and rights; its dependence was during centuries divested of the conventional character, or where this had originally existed, prescription soon began to operate, by which means it was cast into the shade; but the regulation of the public-system might, through deliberations and decrees in single instances, have been modified in the more or less extended circle that happened to predominate.

Nevertheless, should it be asked whether public opinion was not entirely hostile to the existing state of things, and whether demands on the part of the people to participate in that, which the aristocracy exclusively possessed, may not be universally adduced from the earliest times as the reclamation of a property unjustly withheld from them—I answer, no. It may be said that in no instance can such attachment be proved on the part of the people to their aristocracy, as could be compared with their former devotion to the heroic princes; but tranquillity and contentment might be preserved amongst them for centuries by the beneficent indulgence of the governing body, while by means of individual

¹ Thuc. 6. 4. says of the Geloans: *Νόμιμα δὲ Δωρικὰ ἐπέθη αὐτοῖς*; where the Geloans also give to the Agrigentans their *νόμιμα*; 6. 5. *νόμιμα τὰ χαλκιδικὰ ἐκράτησε*.

concessions, which involved no particular danger to the nobles as a class, the aspiring, though not the rebellious demands of the people might be satisfied. For although a stirring and active spirit may have characterised the Grecian *demus* in the youthful vigour of its existence, there can be no doubt that its first efforts were directed to the object of providing for its physical well-being² and the security of its personal rights, whilst seditious commotions were for the most part the consequences of despotic oppression, of wanton attacks on personal security, and on chastity in particular, as in Naxos³; but claims to a share in the government were slowly and gradually developed. Now whilst the course of history proves that where a constitution has been assented to by all ranks and conditions of society, it may be still followed by repeated general revolutions, it is peculiar to the political development of those communities in which prescriptive usage prevails, to make the rights and grievances of *individuals* the subjects of litigation and contention⁴. Of this character were the claims of the Grecian *demus*; first, murmurs and struggles against the oppressive exactions of the aristocratic class, and then positive demands; for, like the Roman *plebs*, it grew bolder with the acquisitions it made. But that it never enquired after the ultimate grounds of the actual order of things, the distance between the nobles as the governing, and itself as the governed, and that it possessed within itself no political impulse, which in its earliest stages clearly conceived and conse-

² Aristot. Pol. 6. 2. 1. 2.

³ See § 35. n. 45.

⁴ Aristot. ap. Ath. 8. 348. B. C.

quentially developed the principle, that the supreme power was the indefeasible right of the bulk of the people, are evinced by the character of the Attic demus, for our only evidence of the democratic cries which it is said to have uttered in the earliest ages, is the deceptive echo of interested and partial advocates under the political system of after-times; whilst the real fact is, that it for several centuries yielded cheerful obedience to the Eupatridæ. Even where the mass seems to step forward most decidedly with the consciousness of its rights, and with claims for itself as the chief element of the state, we behold it willingly enrolling itself under a demagogue, and paving the way to tyranny, as if conscious of its own deficiency in solid and substantial claims, and full of reverence for the personal qualifications of the holders of power.

Clearly to comprehend, that the ancient aristocracy of the noble order was a firmly established form of constitution, and not such a dispensation of government as was unnatural and brought about by force, it is necessary to advert to those points in which it differed from the oligarchy which was introduced after the full development of democracy. The views entertained concerning the aristocracy of the earlier ages will be erroneous if we transfer to it the indignant expressions which the demus and its leaders in later ages applied to the oligarchs who were contemporary with themselves. The most prominent feature of the latter age is, that the rulers are characterised as the few, the people as the majority or all⁵, and the oligarchs as a single

⁵ Thuc. 2. 86:—τὸ πλεον τοῖς ὀλίγοις ἢ τὸ ἑλαττον τοῖς πᾶσι; 6. 38: οἱ πολλοί, τὸ πλεθος, τὸ πλεον. Compare vol. III. cap. 7.

ingredient appertaining to the mass, and unnaturally separated from it⁶. The latter, accordingly, appear without any fixed and substantial character by which their condition of privilege and power could be justified and supported, but are confined to the mere relation of numbers, wherein the people naturally felt their superiority⁷. But instead of thus opposing to each other forms, without qualities in which substance and sign are equally unfixed⁸, and by which the rulers of the ancient aristocracy are divested of every thing which could have led them to power, or rendered them capable and worthy of wielding it, let us turn our attention from these arbitrary symbols to the true nature of their rank itself, and to their qualifications for the same. Thus considered they present themselves to our observation as Geomori, Hippobotæ, Hippeis, Eupatridæ, etc.; and since the Pythagoreans must be included in the enumeration, as the morally good and noble, and are essentially distinguished by their substantial qualities from the oligarchs of later times, who, through accidental possessions, or the caprice of fortune, and without due regard to political qualifications, but on all occasions with the impress of faction stepped from out the ranks of the people, and made them groan beneath their yoke. In the aristocracy of the earlier times the numerical disproportion was less apparent on account of their eminence for the qualities essential to political

⁶ Thus Athenagoras, in Syracuse, Thuc. 6. 39. says: δῆμον ξύμπαν ὠνομάσθαι, ὀλιγαρχίαν δὲ μέρος.

⁷ Τοῦ πλῆθους ὑπεροχή, Aristot. Pol. 4. 10. 2.

⁸ See Aristotle's strictures on the superficial notions prevalent in his time. Polit. 3. 5. 7; 4. 3. 6, sqq.; 4. 10. 2; comp. Eth. Nicom. 3. 5. 7; 4. 3. 6.

rulers. The smallness of their number had nothing odious in it; they may be characterised as the politically best (*ἄριστοι*), their authority as that of the best-aristocracy, or, in consequence of the distance between all earthly excellence and perfection, we may, with Plato⁹, call it timocracy, compared with which the subsequent oligarchy must only be looked upon as a degeneration, the Greeks themselves regarding it in the same light¹⁰. Hence that order of things does not appear to have been produced by an accidental or temporary ascendant, a mere usurpation of the political administration¹¹, during which the supreme power really belonged to the demus, nor as a deviation from the prescriptive course, unnatural in itself, and odious to the people; on the contrary, it was a form of government which was firmly rooted in the natural feeling, and allied to the heroic monarchy in good, as the subsequent oligarchy was to the tyranny in evil attributes.

Accordingly, if it be asked which of the three principles, that may be laid down in the political field under examination as standards for the various claims to participation in the sovereign power, is adapted to the above described order of things,

⁹ De Repub. 8. 547. D. sqq.

¹⁰ Plato de Repub. 8. 550. C. sqq.; Politic. 291. D. sqq.; Aristot. Eth. Nicom. 8. 10; Polit. 4. 5. 9. sqq. Aristotle overlooks the difference between the ancient and modern ages, when, in Pol. 4. 3. 8, he ascribes wealth and nobility to the *ὀλίγοι* in general, consequently to all the members of the oligarchical faction in his time—*ὀλιγαρχία, ὅταν οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ εὐγενέστεροι ὀλίγοι ὄντες κ. τ. λ.*, these qualities at that time frequently being merely incidental to number, as number had formerly been to quality.

¹¹ Aristot. Pol. 3. 4. 1: *κύριον μὲν γὰρ πανταχοῦ τὸ πολίτευμα τῆς πόλεως· πολίτευμα δ' ἐστὶν ἡ πολιτεία. Λέγω δὲ, οἷον ἐν μὲν ταῖς δημοκρατίαις κύριος ὁ δῆμος, οἱ δ' ὀλίγοι τούναντίον ἐν ταῖς ὀλιγαρχίαις.* Comp. 4. 5. 5; 5. 5. 8. These passages throw light upon 4: 13. 14, where Aristotle appears to allude to the administration—not to the legal title to supreme power.

viz.: 1. The oligarchical—unequal rights without regard to qualities, 2. The ochlocratical—equal rights with unequal qualities, 3. That which lies midway between the two, and though considered in a different point of view, a joint property of aristocracy and democracy—equal rights with equal qualities, we answer the third, whilst the first and second must be declared almost equally foreign to its spirit. Our attention must therefore be solely directed to aristocracy, and a healthful democracy¹² in its earliest stages.

All their varieties of intermixture and combination could scarcely be exhausted by the most detailed investigation, many cannot be ranged under any standard of political law; which chiefly applies to the degree of lenity or rigour with which power was exercised in arbitrary hands; although the people do not look with speculative refinement to the abstract principles of right, but for the most part judge according to the temper with which power is employed; whilst no fixed principle can be laid down as to the degree of personal merit which had raised and afterwards supported the aristocracy generally, but which must have varied in individual cases.

Another most important combination resulted from the exclusiveness which was secured to the aristocratic class, from the limitation to its own circle of intermarriage, the right of possessing

¹² It will immediately be perceived in what respects that which has been here advanced differs from the fundamental opinions in Tittmann's excellent work. See in particular, p. 364—366. 382. 496. 521. 524. 528. 533. of that work. It must be equally evident that the difference of opinion between him and myself upon general questions, exclusively applies to the earlier age, and turns upon particular facts only in reference to the constitutions after the Persian war.

landed property and military distinction. By rigorously closing access to an order to withhold from the people the means of attaining a share in the supreme power, was more oppressive than to remove that power beyond their reach; on the other hand, it was making a greater concession to place them in a position from which they might obtain every thing as a right, than it would have been to satisfy the claims of individuals as it were through favour. Now, however variously the nature of a constitution may be modified by the regulation of its orders, this being the fountain, whilst the exercise of the supreme power is the stream flowing from it; still the preceding outline of the leading relations amongst the order may enable us to form an estimate of a particular constitution. Even the subject under examination, participation in the exercise of the supreme power, based upon the regulation of the orders, presents such manifold ramifications of aristocracy and democracy, that completeness of investigation would only lead us into subtilty¹³: we therefore limit ourselves to the task of considering the three chief bodies by which the chief power in the Grecian states was represented, namely, the council, the popular assembly, and the public functionaries.

III. THE COUNCIL AND THE POPULAR ASSEMBLY.

§ 37. In most of the Grecian states, governed by an aristocracy, particularly in those of Doric origin, the council, as an assembly of the aged, was entitled *Gerusia*, *Geronia*¹. Experience is the

¹³ See Aristotle's observations, *Pol.* 4. 5. 1, sqq.; 4. 10; 5. 6. 3.

¹ *Γερουσία*, *γερωνία*. Compare Müller, *Dor.* 2. 91. n.

characteristic of age, and even without legislative enactments, it is natural that in deliberative proceedings mature age should take precedence of youth; moreover, it was a rule in aristocratic constitutions that the members of the council should retain their seats for life, and its distinctive feature was the paternal and venerable character peculiar to old age; finally, in certain states, as in Sparta, it was legally ordained, that none but men of advanced age should be admitted; upon the same principle amongst the Malians it was selected from the veterans². In other respects the political qualifications of the members of the council were the same as those of their order, viz. timocratic; the ordinances which regulated the mode in which promotion from the aristocracy to the council was effected, and the order established in it, emanated exclusively from the collective nobles, and the council is only to be regarded as a particular circle set apart for the exercise of the highest power, belonging to the body of nobles which it represented. A remarkable example of their solicitude to insure the rights of the order against danger from the preponderance of single families, is afforded by the Cnidian law, by which the father excluded the son and the elder brother the younger, from a seat in the council³. The limitation of the number of its members was unquestionably very ancient, as the eighty in Argos, the ninety in Elis, the sixty in Cnidus, the hundred and eighty in Epidaurus⁴; but a change of persons by rota-

² Arist. Pol. 4. 10. 10. The *ὀπλιτευκότες* had the superintendence in the capacity of a council; those who were still in active service held the offices.

³ Arist. Pol. 5. 5. 3.

⁴ See § 35.

tion⁵ is opposed to the natural tendency of the aristocratic system to appoint members for life; hence, no more were chosen than were necessary to replace such members as had gone out⁶.

Βουλῇ, a word peculiar to the states of Doric origin, signifies in Homer⁷ the council of the nobles; with the progress of political society it became almost universally the designation of a council tending to democracy⁸, the members of which, in conformity to the change of families in the younger aristocracy, which was based upon easily acquired, and as easily dissipated external possessions, naturally changed in process of time. The determination of a certain number was here unavoidable; as examples, partly selected from later times, may be adduced the thousand in Crotona⁹, Locri¹⁰, and Rhegium¹¹, the above named six hundred in Elis, etc. A council of this nature was here and there instituted in lieu of an aristocratic Gerusia, as in Epidamnus¹²; or in such a manner, that the latter was not abolished. The thousand in Rhegium degenerated into an oligarchy, as well as the thousand in Agrigentum, who thus appertain to a later age, and were abolished by Empedocles¹³.

Both the Gerusia and the Bule appear as organs through which the participation of the collective

⁵ This principle is fully developed in Hüllmann, Staatsv. d. Alterth. 177—179.

⁶ Compare Aristot. Pol. 4. 5. 11. ⁷ Il. 2. 53; comp. § 18. n. 18, sqq.

⁸ Aristot. Pol. 6. 5. 13. *βουλῇ δημοτικόν*.

⁹ Jamblich. in vit. Pythag. 45; Porphy. 18. from Dicæarchus.

¹⁰ Polyb. 12. 16. 10. 11.

¹¹ Heracl. Pont. 25.

¹² Arist. Pol. 5. 1. 6.

¹³ Diog. Laert. 8. 66. — A council composed of so many members appears almost like a circle of full-citizens, by which the agency of the general body was superseded; as was afterwards the case with the 5000 in Athens. Comp. Hüllmann, Staatsv. 327. 328. This forms the transition to the civic deputies (n. 16.)

body of citizens in the supreme power was brought about and modified. This participation took place in the popular assemblies¹⁴, which, by virtue of the political tendency of the Greeks to publicity, existed under all the constitutions of Greece, except where tyranny had abolished all forms, but the mention of which in a state, is no proof of the existence of a democracy. Its character must be chiefly deduced from that of the class of persons composing it. A natural consequence of the narrow extent of the Greek states in general, was, that all the citizens attended the assembly; but here we must bear in mind the difference between the townsmen and the Pericæci. Without reference to the dominant class, properly so called, the townsmen in general ranked above the Pericæci¹⁵. This was chiefly displayed in their attending the popular assembly, which was their exclusive privilege, or one at least which, from circumstances, they enjoyed in a peculiar degree, those assemblies being uniformly held in the city, as the seat of government, and upon occasions, in which a speedy resolution was required, none but the inhabitants of the town being convoked. Hence it appears that only a part of the

¹⁴ The Doric *άλία* (*ἀλιτιάς*, the place of the popular assembly in Argos), the affinity of which with *ήλιαία* is placed beyond doubt; (in Tarentum its name was *άλιαία*, see Hesych. 1. 230.) See in refutation of the erroneous derivation of the last word from *ήλιος*, Steph. Byz., and Etym. M. *ήλιαία*, where *άλις*, *ἀλιζεσθαι* is given as the root. Compare the Homeric *ἀολλήης*, the Herodotean *ἀλής*, the Spartan *ἀπελλάζειν*, (Plut. Lyc. 6.); Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 215. 216; Müll. Dor. 2. 86. Herodotus likewise employs *άλιη*, in speaking of non-Doric states, as Miletus, 5. 29; Thebes, 5. 79: however, it is probable that in these the word *ἐκκλησία* was in general use. After Homer, *Ἀγορά* is seldom found in the sense of popular assembly (Herod. 6. 11, it is applied to the Ionian council of war); it was probably employed in Crete alone as a fixed appellation for such a body (Bekker, Anecd. 210); it generally signifies the place where it met, and with reference to the multitude assembled there for that purpose, the Paphian and Thessalian *λίμην* (Hesych. 2. 480, Bekker, Anecd. 210.) was equivalent to it: *λαικάρη* in Agrigentum (Inscript. Gruter, 401.) must probably be referred to a later age.

¹⁵ Compare § 32.

people exercised the supreme power, and so far, for instance, Sparta's constitution, in which it is probable that the townsmen alone, the Spartans properly so called, composed the assembly, may be termed oppressively aristocratic. Another expedient for limiting the number of citizens admitted to the popular assembly, was adopted in the subsequent oligarchies; for in order to give the disaffected and seditious no opportunity to assemble, the despots treated with civic deputies, called Probuli or Syncleti¹⁶, which certainly does not convey a very adequate notion of popular representation. In those states where the demus resided in the city, its presence in the assembly was a matter of course, and, as was observed above, this unfolded the germ of democratic self-consciousness much earlier than amongst the rarely-excited inhabitants of the country. However, even there the ascendant of the assembly was not firmly established till the commencement of the sixth century before the Christian era, nor had it yet succeeded in obtaining entire independence, for the preponderating influence of the council exhibited itself in so many particulars, that the assembly can scarcely be estimated, except in its connection with that body. This is mainly attributable to the nature of those subjects which the council submitted to it for consideration. The lowest privilege which ought to remain in the hands of a free people, is, according to Aristotle¹⁷, that of electing and judging the magistrates;

¹⁶ Aristot. Pol. 4. 11. 9; 4. 12. 8; 6. 5. 10; 13. 3. 1. 7; *ἐνίοις γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι δῆμος, οὐδ' ἐκκλησίαν νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ συγκλήτους*. Probably of a similar nature were the Ephesian *ἐπικλητοί*, Strab. 14. 640, who appear to have been identical with the five *βουλαι*, Steph. Byz. *βέννα*; comp. Müller, Dor. 2. 86. 87; Tittmann, 527.

¹⁷ Pol. 2. 9. 4.—*μηδὲ γὰρ τούτου κύριος ὦν ὁ δῆμος δοῦλος ἂν εἴη*.

but the people were far from possessing such a power in those rigorous aristocracies under which the magistrates were exclusively chosen from among the nobles; the elections took place within this circle; it was only necessary that those who were chosen by their equals in rank, should be presented to the popular assembly; but irresponsibility, i. e., the absence of a liability to be called to account by the general body, was naturally founded in the relation of the orders to one another. But when riches had qualified new candidates for rank and office, the election was more frequently made by the people at large. A very remarkable regulation existed in Mantinea¹⁸, by which a certain number of citizens were chosen from the general body, and nominated electors. Questions concerning war and peace were, it is probable, most frequently put to the vote in the popular assembly. On the other hand, the courts of law, especially that which took cognizance of criminal matters, were, for the most part, the prerogative of the nobility, as was the right of making regulations concerning divine worship¹⁹. However, whatever matters may have been transacted in the popular assembly, the initiative was indubitably vested in the council alone; it weighed over every subject beforehand, and drew up a *Probuleuma*, which was submitted to the people. This practice existed for a time in full vigour, even under the more matured democracies, and in form it was always retained; therefore, in a democracy which was still in its infancy, no individual member of the popular assembly can possibly have possessed the right of making a

¹⁸ Aristot. Pol. 6. 2. 2.

¹⁹ See other modifications, Aristot. Pol. 4. 11.

positive and distinct motion on any state matter. The popular assembly can, during the whole of this period, have scarcely been any where so dependent as only to be convened for the purpose of receiving a decree of the council; it is much more probable that its lowest privilege consisted in deciding by a simple aye or no, but, at the same time, most of the popular assemblies were limited to this. The right of debate, from its nature, appertained to the council; but the manner in which it was exercised, was, probably, as in the Roman *conciones*²⁰, often very disorderly. Formalities, so closely interwoven with the political existence of Rome, and there of such vast influence, were never introduced to such an extent amongst the Greeks; consequently they cannot, in a considerable degree, have aided any attempt on the part of the council to restrict the popular assembly. Lastly, the same may be observed of their religious ceremonies, nor did they, like the Romans, attempt to influence its agency by means of religious scruples, and thus preclude the execution of any measure that might happen to be unpalatable to the aristocratic order.

¹ IV. THE OFFICERS OF STATE.

§ 38. In states, where the aristocratic body possessed the supreme power, all offices of importance, to which a portion of that power was delegated, were, like the council, emanations from the ruling order, and, therefore, the same qualifications were required for them as for that order itself; however, regard may very generally have been had to age,

²⁰ See my Rom. Hist. 304, sqq.

¹ Ἀρχαί, τέλη, οἱ ἐν τέλει, τιμαί. See Append. xiv.

and occasionally the higher officers were taken from the superior nobility, as the Demuchi from the Thespiadæ in Thespiæ². But the care of conducting expensive public works required considerable wealth; the command in war, eminent personal endowments, and the priesthood, immaculate nobility, and, in part, such as was inherent in certain families; hence it may be assumed, that within the circle of the nobility a scrutiny (*δοκιμασία*) very soon began to precede election. The admission of common freemen to offices of state, kept pace with the gradations in the decline of aristocracy³; when the importance of riches began to be acknowledged, the appointment to offices became associated with the census. However, whatever standard of eligibility in general may have been adopted, in particular instances regard was had to the qualities requisite for an office, a Dokimasia took place, and the more deserving candidate was elected. Election by lot must at this stage have been entirely unknown.

In considering that portion of the supreme power which was comprised in the functions of the officers, it is necessary to enquire whether it was confided to them by the state, directly or indirectly. In the political communities of Greece, many branches of the administration belonged to the state, not immediately, but in conjunction with certain corporate bodies, and the regulations for their management did not emanate from its centre⁴, but from the close circle of those corporations themselves.

² § 35, n. 30.

³ See the modifications, Aristot. Pol. 4. 12. 10.

⁴ Ἀπὸ κοινῆς ἐστίας, Aristot. Pol. 6. 5. 11.

Many of these offices, amongst others, those of a sacerdotal nature, exercised very great influence on the public system in general: through their existence, the range and the importance of such as directly proceeded from the state, became greatly limited. However, our chief attention must not be directed to what was thus introduced into the state, but to what proceeded from its centre, and diffused itself over the people at large. To these immediate offices were attached, from the very earliest periods of aristocracy, precedence in the council and the command in the field. The administration of justice was partially vested in priestly families; but the supreme judicial power was the attribute of the body of the people. Every magistrate of this kind stood in a direct relation to the aggregate people as the source of political power. Such a gradation in the higher offices of state as rendered one subject to the other, was scarcely to be met with in Grecian communities, except in military affairs, in which it was inseparable from the nature of their duties; therefore, in other departments it was a rare occurrence that inferior magistrates were appointed by superior ones, the only division being into magistrates and servants (*ὑπηρεσται*), not higher and lower magistrates. The number of regular offices in the ancient Grecian communities was small; it is a characteristic of young and aristocratic states, to institute as few magistracies in the strict sense of the term as possible; they prefer to keep unlimited power as near as they can to the main body of the ruling order, and to appoint temporary commissions adapted to the exigencies of the occasion, but not constituting

permanent offices⁵. The disposition to delegate power to boards or commissions of this nature, maintained its ground afterwards in the Grecian democracies; in the most extensive sense the liturgies belonged to this class. This tenacity of transferring the rights of the body of the people to individual authorities, is somewhat at variance with the practice of conferring seats in the council for life, and the custom mentioned by Aristotle⁶, prevalent in the more ancient democracies, of filling offices for longer periods of time: but again, there existed in many states securities against the abuse of official power—for instance, it was expressly and rigorously prohibited that any person should retain office beyond his appointed time⁷, or hold two offices together, or the same twice⁸.

Official powers were not very cautiously limited⁹. The council, it is true, constantly took part in the duties of the magistracy, but in many respects the latter possessed a discretionary power. But this power could not be exercised irresponsibly, as an enquiry into their conduct inevitably awaited them in the Euthyne¹⁰ at the termination of their official career.

The Euthyne may be called the Dokimasia inverted; if the latter had inspired the candidate with confidence before he entered office, the former was destined to prove, whether that confidence

⁵ Ἐπιμελίσαι, originally the duties of an agent, afterwards their object, Aristot. Pol. 4. 12. 3, where the office itself is vaguely distinguished from permanent offices. See Æschin. c. Ctesiph. 398. 400; Boeckh Pub. Econ. 1. 257. ⁶ Pol. 5. 8. 3.

⁷ See on the subject of the Bœotarchs, Corn. Nep. Epam. 9; Paus. 9. 14. 2. ⁸ See Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 541.

⁹ See the excellent remarks of Hüllmann, Staatsr. d. Althert. 291; conf. Tittmann, 544.

¹⁰ The word εὐθύνη expresses the opposition to σκόλαι θέμιστες, the perversion of justice, crooked courses.

had been properly reposed or not, and the prospect of it to deter officers from improper conduct. The Euthyne was originally a limitation of the princely government of the nobles: this is the real meaning of the statement that it was introduced into Athens with the archonship of Medon¹¹, and thus it appears in the case of Cresphontes¹². This dependence of the magistracy upon the aristocratic class, and the perhaps irregular interference of the latter, led to the institution of a formal scrutiny after a magistrate had completed his term of service. This first took place within the circle of the holders of power, as in the Æolic Cuma¹³; the participation of the demus in it originated by degrees; it was the same case with the officers appointed for the scrutiny itself as peculiar magistrates, Euthyni and Logistæ¹⁴, in the nomination of whom the character of the constitution might become doubly apparent, inasmuch as it was asked, which order possessed the right of electing those officers, and what qualifications as to rank rendered eligible. The extreme of democracy was afterwards developed, not so much in the duties of the Athenian Euthyni, as in the right of accusing public functionaries in the popular assembly.

In certain states there arose a sort of magis-

¹¹ § 29. n. 10.

¹² § 29. n. 12.

¹³ § 35. n. 34.

¹⁴ Plato de Legg. 12. 946 sqq.; Aristot. Pol. 6. 5. 10: *καλοῦσι δὲ τοὺτους οἱ μὲν εὐθύνας, οἱ δὲ λογιστάς, οἱ δ' ἐξεταστάς, οἱ δὲ συνηγόρους*. Comp. Schneider Comment. 502. Of a similar character would appear to have been the *μασπῆρες* in Harpocr., if we understand *εὐθύναι*, after *μασπρίαί*, in Hesych. as well as the Rhodian and Pallenian *μάστροι*, see Hesych. and Harpocr. Compare Photius *μάστειρες*. On Athens, see § 47. n. 49.

trates corresponding to the Euthyni, who became the representatives of the people in their transactions with the superior officers of state. Such were the Spartan Ephori, who did not attain their importance as they were instituted by Lycurgus, but with the further progress of the constitution, and on that account it is necessary to mention them here ¹⁵; transcending the originally narrow sphere of their legitimate province, they entered upon that of the censors; the authority of all other officers was overbalanced by the antagonist authority of the ephoralty; like the Roman tribunes of the people, they converted what was intended for defence into a means of aggression, which ended by becoming highly detrimental to the due balance amongst the members of the body politic. The nomophylaces, so often spoken of ¹⁶, did not in any state of Greece attain that importance which their name implies, and the preceding observations refer to none but the Ephors of Sparta ¹⁷. But with the progress of the demus there arose an office, viz., that of the Demiurgi, which was as much of a democratic ¹⁸ as that of the Probuli was of an aristocratic nature. They were to be found in Doric and in other states ¹⁹; their province was not the representation of the people, they were popular agents; but it appears wholly incredible that they were any where previously to the Persian war the highest function-

¹⁵ The subject is fully investigated § 42. n. 77, sqq.

¹⁶ See § 40. n. 27. In Tarentum they were called *ῥητροφύλακες*, Phot. and Etym. M.

¹⁷ See Tittm. gr. Staatsv. 547.

¹⁸ Ibid. 358, 367.

¹⁹ Müller, Dor. 2. 141.

aries, as the misinterpretation of a word in Aristotle²⁰ might lead us to suppose; they were probably mere adjuncts of the superior officers in the measures they took for the good of the people²¹. The Epidemiurgi sent by Corinth to Potidæa, were inspectors and superintending officers²².

A survey of the individual magistrates with reference to the share of the highest power possessed by them respectively, can only include those who immediately emanated from the ruling body, and exercised a supervision over it in their turn. Aristotle calls the Basileis, Prytanes, and Archons²³, magistrates who went forth from the common and sacred hearth of the state with a mission to watch over all matters connected with the public worship. The nature of the subsequent Basileia has been already discussed; it was a mere shadow of the ancient princely splendour; but most closely and intimately allied with its real character was the dignity of the Prytanes.

The Prytaneum, a main ingredient in the political life of every Grecian state, which made any pretensions to independence²⁴, like the Prytanes, proceeded from the ancient monarchy. In the heroic age the high-priesthood was associated with

²⁰ Pol. 5. 8. 3: τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον οἱ δῆμοι καθίστασαν πολυχρονίους τὰς δημιουργίας καὶ τὰς θεωρίας. These two words do not here express particular dignities, but are general designations for those offices of the democracy which related to ὅσια and ιερά. Comp. Aristot. Pol. 4. 3. 14; Schneid. ad loc.

²¹ Etym. M. Δημιουργός. Amongst the Argives and Thessalians, οἱ περὶ τὰ τέλη. Comp. Thuc. 5. 47.

²² Thuc. 1. 56. The Scolion compares them to Phylarchs, strictly aristocratic magistrates.

²³ Polit. 6. 5. 11: ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἐστίας ἔχουσι τὴν τιμὴν· καλοῦσι δ' οἱ μὲν ἄρχοντας τούτους, οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς, οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις.

²⁴ See Casaub. ad Ath. 15. 700 D.; Spanheim de Vesta et Prytanib. in Græv. thes. n. 14; Blanchard sur les Prytanes in Mém. de l'Acad. d. Inscript. v. 7, as well as in Naucratis, Athen. 4. 150. D. On Peparethos, Thuc. 3. 89.

it, and the sacred hearth of the state²⁵ was then in the princely castle, where the council used to assemble around it²⁶. With the commencement of the aristocracies the sacred hearth of the state ceased to be the object of royal care; the Prytaneum indeed continued to be the sanctuary of the state, where that fire²⁷ was kept up which was an emblem of its life, and of the divine protection it enjoyed, and the chief magistrate was appointed to tend it in lieu of the prince: but it remained the central point of government for a very short time; the Buleuterion or the Archeum was selected for the transaction of the strictly political affairs that daily presented themselves, but a sacred hearth of the council was removed to the former of these²⁸. From that time the Prytaneum, like the council-house²⁹, appears to have been a central point, where functionaries officially engaged resided, but where, at the same time, the religious character continued to predominate; on that account it was thenceforward fixed upon for the place of honour and the public meals, because there the person on whom distinction was conferred became most closely bound, and as it were consecrated, to the state.

²⁵ Ἑστία κοινή, the same as *πρυτανεῖον*, Poll. 9. 40; Ath. 5. 187. D.; and Casaub. *Focus urbis*, Cic. *de legib.* 2. 12. Compare, in particular, Creuzer *Symbol.* 2. 627.

²⁶ Comp. Hullman. *Anf. d. gr. Gesch.* 2. 23. According to Plut. *Conviv.* 8. 651, Celeus was the first who formed a union of brave men, and *ὀνόμασαι πρυτανεῖον*. Herein we chiefly perceive the operation of the hospitable principle, and this coincides with his reception of Demeter in Eleusis, Apollod. 3. 14. 7. Comp. Hymn. in Cerer. 184, sqq.

²⁷ Ἄσβεστος λύχνος, πῦρ ἄσβεστον, Paus. 8. 9. 1; 8. 37. 8; Strab. 9. 396; Poll. 1. 7; Schol. Thuc. 2. 15; Proverb, τὸ λύχνον ἐν πρυτανείῳ, Theocr. 21. 36.

²⁸ Ἑστία βουλαία, Xenoph. *Hell.* 2. 3. 52; Æschin. *de falsa Legat.* 227; Harpocr. *βουλαία*; Suid. *δέξις*.

²⁹ Æn. Poliorc. 10: ἡ ἐν πρυτανείῳ ἢ ἐν βουλῇ. Dio Chrys. 2. 254, τὴν δὲ ἀγορὰν καὶ τὸ πρυτανεῖον καὶ τὸ βουλευτήριον. Comp. on Syracuse Cic. *c. Verr.* 4. 58.

Prytanes are recorded as chief magistrates in Corinth³⁰, Corcyra³¹, Miletus³², Eressus in Lesbos³³, Tenedos³⁴, Pergamus³⁵, Cos³⁶, Rhodes³⁷, etc. They were religious-political presidents like the kings, whose substitutes they had become, in many of those cities, guardians of the sacred fire of the state in the Prytaneum, and still filled with the quickening and warming power of the Basileia, in which the ethical predominated over the colder legal-political principle. On that account the word bears a close affinity to Basileus, and is not unfrequently used in its place³⁸, or as a significant designation for the sovereign dignity³⁹; it was probably first of all employed in Athens as a magistracy of the second class; afterwards it became here, as well as in other states, a denomination for the presidents of the community or council, changing periodically, according to the democratic system⁴⁰.

The archonship does not seem to have been so deeply imbued with the antique religious essence, as the word itself expresses presidency without any subordinate notion; it cannot be traced with any degree of certainty as having been em-

³⁰ Diod. Fragm. v. 4. 13; Bipont. Paus. 2. 4. 4.

³¹ Inscription Böckh. Pub. Econ. 2. 403.

³² Aristot. Pol. 5. 4. 5.

³³ Athen. 8. 333 A. Might we not infer from this, that such was the case in the other Lesbian cities?

³⁴ Pind. Nem. 11. See on this point Müll. in Böckh. explic. 476.

³⁵ Spon. Miscell. 79. 348.

³⁶ Hesych. Κέρκος.

³⁷ Polyb. 27. 6. 2; Böckh. ad Pind. Ol. 7. expl. 169. Two, chosen annually, held the presidency for six months each.

³⁸ Suid. Χάρων. Charon wrote βασιλεῖς for the πρυτάνεις in Sparta.

³⁹ Æschyl. Prometh. 169; Dan. 374.

⁴⁰ As in Delphi, Paus. 10. 2. 2, where, however, πρυτανεύοντος may be less general; in Crotona, see Timæus ap. Ath. 12. 522 C.; in Cyzicus, Caylus, rec. 7. 67; Ephesus, Tittmann, 431, et ubi sup.; comp. van Dale dissertationes V.

ployed at an early period to designate a particular office⁴¹, not even in Athens, as will be shewn below, though it became general in the later age as an appellation for a permanent dignity.

Most of the other numerous titles of superior magistrates express the peculiar nature of the official duties annexed to them; as the Cretic Cosmi⁴², the Cosmopolis in the Italian Locri⁴³, the Æsymnete in Cuma⁴⁴ and Chalcedon⁴⁵, the Artynæ in Argos⁴⁶ and Epidaurus⁴⁷, the Hieromnamon in Megara, Byzantium⁴⁸, Chalcedon⁴⁹, the Aphester in Cnidos⁵⁰, the Tagos in Thessaly⁵¹, a word very frequently employed by the poets for ruler in general⁵², the Polemarch in several Bœotian cities⁵³, and, after the institution of the new Archons in Athens, the same with Tamias, in the poets frequently transferred from matters of finance to political government in general⁵⁴. It is probable that the appellations of Strategos, which existed in every democracy, and Proedros, for example in Mitylene⁵⁵, were less ancient.

⁴¹ The εἰς ἄρχων in Epidamnus, (Aristot. Pol. 5. 1. 6; comp. 3. 11. 1.) probably had another special appellation as a magistrate, and moreover belongs to a later age. Concerning Bœotian archons, in Platææ, Chæroneæ, Thebes, etc., see Müller, Bœotia in Ersch. Encyclop. p. 272. It appears to me very doubtful whether these belonged to the earlier time.

⁴² § 35. n. 20.

⁴³ Polyb. 12. 16.

⁴⁴ Aristot. ap. Schol. Eurip. Med. 19.

⁴⁵ Was there one here so early? There were three in Cuma, see Tittmann Gr. Staatsv. 463.

⁴⁶ Thucyd. 5. 47.

⁴⁷ Plut. Qu. Gr. 1.

⁴⁸ Polyb. 4. 52.

⁴⁹ Müll. Dor. 2. 169.

⁵⁰ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 172.

⁵¹ § 26. n. 33.

⁵² Æschyl. Prom. 95. Comp. τάγης, Agam. 110. ταγοῦχος Eumen. 288. Comp. Sophoc. Antig. 1045.

⁵³ On Thebes; see Xenoph. 5. 2. 30; Thespiæ Plut. Demetr. 39.

⁵⁴ Pind. Pyth. 5. 82; Nem. 10. 97; Sophoc. Antig. 1133; compare Stobæus Serm. 12. p. 115.

⁵⁵ Thucyd. 3. 25.

CONSTITUTIONS ESTABLISHED BY LAW.

I. THE RELATION OF LAW TO CUSTOM.

§ 39. When custom and law are conceived in their widest difference, the system which is governed by the former may be described as devoid of volition, and unconscious of an aim, existing in a form coeval with itself, and confirmed by tacit prescription; whilst the distinctive feature of the latter is the self-conscious conception of a rational standard attached to a political body, with a positive declaration as to its future validity. But in the materials which history presents, we cannot draw such a distinction as this. In none of the Grecian states founded after the migrations are we authorised to assume such force of prescription, that a state of total quiescence, a political life without any reflection as to its true destination, and a blind conformity to the natural result of circumstances, were enabled to subsist for any considerable length of time; sooner or later reflection unfolded itself. Now, although the force of habit and a certain slothfulness in rising to free resolutions, may have operated to a considerable extent, and many innovations which were produced in the course of circumstances may have been confirmed without any express declarations and decrees to that effect; still it is far more probable that the first introduction of an institution was preceded by a formal motion, and by deliberation. But acts of this nature were performed in the midst of the governing people, appear consequently as having

grown out of the very heart of nationality, and are deficient in that peculiar mark by which laws are distinguished ; namely, that as it were from a position without the mass something is introduced into it ; it must, however, be attributed to the defectiveness of our sources, that so many institutions are recorded only as actually existing, whilst the causes of their origin and their authors are unknown.

This is the proper place to estimate the political agency of those men, who, without being strictly entitled to the appellation of legislators, lived and wrought in the midst of the people, and by their counsel and conduct exercised practical influence on the decrees of the state. Nor must we omit to mention poetry, which acted in various ways, indirectly, but powerfully, upon the national mind. Such was the effect of the songs of Callinus, Tyr-tæus, Mimnermus and Alcæus ; Solon's elegy on Salamis bore a similar character, and until his laws appeared in their own austere simplicity, a poetical garb in a greater or less degree adorned every political doctrine and exhortation. But of a direct and personal character was the political agency of the men, whom antiquity emphatically denominated sages ; political knowledge was the chief element of their wisdom¹. History has preserved a number of pithy apothegms², which are said to embody their respective ethical and political opinions ; but from these vague and anecdotal attributes, no judgment can be formed as to the political exer-

¹ Dicæarch, ap. Diog. L. 1. 40. calls them *συνετοὺς τινὰς καὶ νομοθετικούς*.

² See Demetr. Phal. ap. Stob. 3. 44, sqq. Orl. ; Plut. Sept. Sapient. Conviv. 6. 586. 587 ; Diog. Laert. 1. 33 ; Hygin. 221.

tions of the men; we should rather regard the traditions which recount their political operations themselves. Mere reflection was not the occupation of any one of them; Solon and Cleobulus were legislators, Periander a tyrant; the others statesmen and men of business, and to these our attention must be particularly directed. To these must be added Thales, who was not only the political counsellor of Cræsus³, but spokesman in the Ionic federal council⁴, and who, after ineffectual efforts for the common good, greatly promoted the welfare of Miletus, by obtaining it the friendship of Cyrus⁵; Bias, who was the author of a political poem on Ionia⁶, and who made the patriotic proposal to cast off the Persian yoke by emigration to Sardinia⁷; Chilon, who was instrumental⁸ in the progressive improvement of the constitution of Lycurgus, although not in the institution of the Ephors⁹; Epimenides in Crete, the political pacificator of Athens by atoning for the murder of Cylon¹⁰, and the author of a poem on the public administration¹¹ of Crete; Heraclitus the severe and bitter censor in Ephesus¹²; and lastly, Hecataeus the logographer¹³. But a higher position must be assigned to Pythagoras as the master and educator of statesmen. It would

³ Herod. 1. 75; Diog. Laert. 1. 38.

⁴ Herod. 1. 170.

⁵ Diog. L. 1. 25.: Κροίσου γὰρ πέμψαντος πρὸς Μιλησίους ἐπὶ συμμαχίᾳ ἐκώλυσεν, ὅπερ Κύρου κρατήσαντος ἔσωσε τὴν πόλιν — applies to the end of the war.

⁶ Diog. L. 1. 83.

⁷ Herod. 1. 170.

⁸ Plut. Ages. 5.

⁹ Æl. V. H. 3. 17. et plura apud Periz.

¹⁰ Thucyd. 1. 126; Cicero de Legg. 2. 11; Plut. Sol. 12; Diog. L. 1. 110; Vatic. app. 3. 97. See several passages in Meurs. Sol. p. 30. and particularly Heinrich's Epimenides.

¹¹ Diog. L. 1. 111.: συνέγραψε περὶ τῆς ἐν Κρήτῃ πολιτείας.

¹² Plut. de Garrul. 8. 33.

¹³ Herod. 5. 36. 125.

be erroneous to consider him as one of the legislators; he claims the first place amongst those statesmen whose influence was direct and personal, as the man who wished to instil into his confidants, and through them into their respective states, exalted political virtue, by living precept and example, but not to lay down the law in the dead letter without the sanctifying efficacy of the feelings. Strictly speaking, he can scarcely be called a legislator, even for the small circle that immediately surrounded him, for here morality reigned, and virtue was expected to grow from the heart, and fertilised and quickened by the inner law¹⁴, to exhibit its influence upon life.

Amongst the causes which led to a departure from the path of prescription and usage, none operated more forcibly than dissensions amongst the members of the aristocratic order or the princes, as in Sparta; in addition to this, the people began to reflect upon the discordance between their own position and the privileged condition of the nobility, and this called up a spirit of resistance and presumptuous pretensions, which were the more effectually asserted when countenanced and supported by the designing and selfish of the upper order itself. Under such circumstances, the want of a new public system was sensibly felt, and the will and the decree that such should be established were a natural consequence. When this was not accomplished by a preponderating body, but resulted from a union between the contending parties, a previous contract guaranteeing the validity of the

¹⁴ Νόμος ἐμψυχος.

law about to be framed, a suitable basis was laid for legislation, it is true; but it was still very far from the intention of the Greeks to quit the path of custom and adhere to an objective standard; on the contrary, their innate tendency to the former first led to the mediation of *Æsymnetæ* and arbitrators.

The *Æsymnetæ*¹⁵, whom Aristotle¹⁶ designates freely-elected rulers, to distinguish them from the tyrants who were originally called by the same name¹⁷, were not designed to make laws so much as to allay the fermenting political matter by means of the vigorous exercise of their personal authority. Now although certain of the *Æsymnetæ* made laws and then abdicated, like Pittacus, this was no more essential to this species of authority, than when others, like Orthagoras in Sicyon, Cypselus in Corinth, and Pisistratus in Athens, perpetuated the same in their own families, and thus paved the way to tyranny. Their most important duties during their administration, were to re-establish justice and legal order, to modify and amend prescriptive usage, and, in general, rather to reconcile conflicting parties by means of their personal influence, than by judicial arbitration.

Nearly allied to the legislators, in the nature of their occupation, were the arbitrators¹⁸. Their duty was to separate the contending parties by

¹⁵ *αἰσνητής*, Il. 24. 347, *αἰσυμνήτης*, *αἰσυμνητήρ*, Od. 8. 258, first signified an umpire in a contest (*βραβευτής*). Conf. Hesych. *αἰσυμνήτηρ* and *αἰσυμνήται*, with the Comment. and the Etym. M.; *αἰσυμνάω* afterwards meant, to rule, Eurip. Med. 19. On the nature of the *Æsymnetæ*, compare § 50. n. 5.

¹⁶ Aristot. in Argum. Soph. Œd. Tyr.

¹⁷ Pol. 4. 8. 2.

¹⁸ *Διαιτηταί*, Herod. 5. 95; *διαλλακταί*, Plut. Sol. 14; *καταρτιστῆρες*, Herod. 4. 168; 5. 28; 106. 161; conf. Pollux 4. 153.

means of arbitration in a given case, or founded upon the whole combination of existing circumstances, and to adjust their respective demands. The establishment of general and permanent precedents was not necessarily annexed to it; but when this was considered expedient, the most natural course which could suggest itself was, to restore and confirm that prescription, the vigour of which had been impaired by dissension, so far as it was not itself repealed by the judgment delivered in the particular case in question. However, where arbitrators or *Æsymnetæ* were chosen, tranquillity was rarely restored; for from continued disunion proceeded, on the one hand, tyranny, and on the other, demands for determinate and comprehensive legislation.

As in these two species of authority, the mutual consent of the litigants to an adjustment of their differences, did not necessarily lead to legislation, so it did not require a previous compact for the introduction of positive laws. Nor does this merely apply to legislation generally, in which respect laws may even be the compulsory edicts of a tyranny, and, consequently, the conventional basis be altogether wanting; but it especially refers to the political development in the Grecian aristocracies under consideration, so far as a removal of the discordances between the people at large and a ruling order, the establishment of a general citizenship, was effected by the laws. For in this case the original impulse, as well as the execution, might proceed from one party, and equity might be exercised, and an equality of political relations established by the holders of power

for the time being, without the previous concurrence of the lower order. In this manner a prince might have satisfied the aristocratic order by means of legislation, and that order, in its turn, the people; it will seldom be found that moderation was the exclusive attribute of the lower orders.

Hence, in enquiring when law succeeded usage, our chief attention must be directed to the peculiar characteristics by which the law itself is distinguished from prescriptive usage and personal authority, and not to the antecedence of an agreement.

The chief of these is positive declaration. We cannot, as was above remarked, in any manner so separate the precept from the usage, as though the latter had been produced and modified without the co-operation of the former, and, as it were, tacitly acquiesced in what circumstances originated and maintained. From the proneness of the Greeks to reflection, their prevailing inclination for oratory, the opportunity afforded in every Grecian state for public debate, and the manifold occasions presented by changes in the external condition of the state, to reflect, and to deliberate in common upon the further expediency of a usage, it was inevitable that usage in itself should be made the subject of reflection, that its nature should be defined, and its future validity be ensured by positive declaration¹⁹; but the force of habit is the support of usage; consequently, it was more easy for the usage, as such, to obtain its sanction through actual practice, than it was for the verbal standard alone and separated from the usage. Thus, a standard enforced by

¹⁹ Hence *νόμος*, law in Sparta and Tarentum, conf. Müll. Dor. 1. 134. 135.

actual practice again became incorporated with the life of the state, maintained its ground as part and parcel of the same, and was guaranteed by itself without appealing for its subsistence to the authority of any external law. The transition from the authority of the usage in itself to that of the word as a command superior to and determining it, was brought about in this as in various other channels of public life in Greece, by the all-powerful influence of poetry: the poet uttered in his descriptions that which he knew to be national. By contemplating the standards established by custom for regulating the general order of things, he was led to form political maxims; these, in their turn, infused themselves into the national mind, in whose centre and core poetry found life and sustenance; of vast importance, therefore, in the history of the political development of the Greeks is the rise of the *gnome*. But the victory of positive declaration over tacit custom was finally achieved by the introduction of writing, and thenceforward the law became confirmed in its independence, and stood in no danger of being supplanted by custom.

Still more important than the advancement of the law beyond the circle of prescriptive usage, and one of its chief characteristics, was the raising it above personal influence, into an absolute command, not rendered obligatory in any particular case by the will of the temporary depositary of power, but emanating from the aggregate mind of the state, durable, independent, and invariable. The gradations in its development correspond with the three constitutions—monarchy, aristocracy, and demo-

cracy. In the first, namely, the old Grecian hereditary monarchy, the law advanced least of all beyond the personal sphere; here uniformity of procedure was the safest course; but the separation of a standard of the same from the person became necessary, after a plurality of rulers and change of families in the aristocracy gave rise to a diversity of opinions; but this necessity became most imperious at the commencement of the democracy, wherein the change of magistrates necessarily prevented the continuance of that system which rendered the administration of political power dependent upon individual discretion, at the same time that the body of the people had not yet acquired the pernicious and insane habit of drawing every thing before their own immediate circle, and of determining upon every occasion by a fresh resolution, thus resolving the laws into psephisms.

Finally, with regard to the framing and introduction of the laws, this certainly may have been effected by means of formal motions and proposals in the midst of the sovereign people, after joint examination and reflection, and, at the same time, prescription to a considerable extent have become moulded into law: however, there is a disposition in the transmitters of historical matter, which is nearly allied to the attachment of the Greeks to personal authority, to ascribe the laws of a state to single persons, to represent them as the products of their individual minds, and thus almost diametrically to oppose them to national prescription. This was eminently the case in the mythical traditions, which represented the oldest legal polity as produced by the fiat of a supreme head, as in Crete

by Minos, in Attica by Theseus, in Tenedos by Tennes, etc. This was continued till the historical age. In spite of the frequent appeal to the ancestral and the prescriptive, the neglect of the root and influence of immemorial usage very soon rendered the path of historical research impracticable; even in ancient times people were too prone to discover evidences of design, of reflection, and positive precept, and in modern days it has been too often attempted to cultivate this barren field. This resulted from the inclination of the Greeks to view every thing in an historical light; the disposition which, in mythology, referred so many collective persons to the infancy of states, is here revived, and the Romulus and Remus of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, may be regarded as specimens of it; nor are the accounts of Lycurgus by any means exempt from it²⁰. To this must be added their proneness to ascribe as much as possible to one person, which, associated with that person's name, might be more conveniently retained in the memory and cited; thus, a number of Athenian ordinances are ascribed to Solon, in the enactment of which we shall immediately perceive that he had no share, if we consider them with reference either to their age or spirit.

The Greeks exhibit a still greater want of discrimination, when unworthily denying that which was the natural and spontaneous product of their own nationality, they represent a legislator as a compiler of various institutions, and his work as a collection of shreds and patches; as when Zaleucus

²⁰ Comp. Cicero de Repub. 12. 123, ed. St.

is said to have framed his laws upon the model of Laconian, Cretan, and Areopagite statutes²¹. This favourite notion of antiquity seems to have given rise to the tradition of the Roman legal deputation to Athens; and hence, finally, the Grecian historians are, both in religion and in politics, not only willing, but even solicitous to alienate their own national property, by representing their legislators Lycurgus²², Solon²³, and Cleobulus²⁴, as bringing home the institutions of foreign countries. This was mainly attributable to their desire to construct all their opinions on a genetic basis, so that the accidental discovery of a resemblance between a Grecian and a foreign institution, immediately led them to conclude that the one was derived from the other. However, it is natural to suppose that an acquaintance with foreign institutions, acquired by more extended intercourse, awakened and stimulated reflection on their own.

II. THE MEANS WHICH BROUGHT ABOUT THE AUTHORITY OF THE LAWS.

§ 40. After the heroic age religion still continued to be the ultimate ground and highest sanction of law; the gods, especially the tutelary deities of the state, were considered its guardians; to them was directed the oath of the citizen, and they were adjured to vengeance in the public malediction¹ pronounced against offenders. At the same

²¹ Ephor. ap. Strab. 6. 260.

²² Plut. Lyc. 4.

²³ Herod. 2. 177.

²⁴ Diog. L. 1. 89.

¹ Πολιτικὴ ἀρά. See concerning Charondas, Strab. 6. 289; comp. Plut. Alcib. 22; Blanchard in Mém. de l'Acad. d. Insc. v. 16.

time the lineal tie between the laws and the gods was not severed; for as the old tradition depicted the laws of Minos as the revelations of Zeus², so there existed in after ages a notion of especial confidence between the legislator and a deity; thus Lycurgus was regarded as the confidant of the Delphian god, and his laws were considered to be the divine declarations³, as in the subsequent dependence of Sparta upon the oracle of Delphi, the latter exercised as it were a perpetual legislative power; there was also a tradition of a confidential relation between Zaleucus and Pallas⁴.

The custom of considering the most ancient laws as framed by kings, appears to have given rise to a somewhat erroneous notion, viz. that it was requisite that absolute power should be lodged in the law-giver, such as was annexed to the Roman decemvirate⁵. Now the legislative functions of Draco⁶ and Solon coincided with their archonship, it is true, but it is much more probable that they were annexed to the dignity, than that on their account the archonship was conferred upon the legislators⁷.

But the main support of the laws was derived from the deep reverence which the people felt for

² Odyss. 19. 178.

³ Plut. de Pyth. Orac. 7. 588; Ælian V. H. 14. 29; Photius *ῥῆτρα* — *ὡς ἐκ χρησμοῦ*. Comp. Suid. *ῥῆτρα*.

⁴ Aristot. ap. Schol. Pind. Ol. 10. 17; Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. 352. A. ed. Mor.; Plut. de sui laude, 8. 147; comp. Heyne Opusc. 2. 65. Note g.

⁵ See my Rom. Hist. 355.

⁶ He wrote laws *ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς*, Paus. 9. 38. 4.

⁷ With reference to the eighteen years' presidency of Lycurgus, during which he is said to have promulgated his ordinances, Simonides says in the Schol. Plat. de Repub. 431. Tauchn. *ῆρξε*; from which, however, we cannot draw any strict inference as to the opinion of Simonides.

the divine protection extended over them, and therefore to effect cheerful and permanent obedience to their precepts, the legislators brought into requisition the whole ethical capacity of the citizens. The interfusion of ethics and politics, which passed from institutions of state-policy into the schools of the philosophers, was grounded in the national feeling of the Greeks; hence proceeded the ethical basis and framework of the ancient laws. This principle was intended to operate in habituating the citizen to a lawful way of life, by means of the closest connection between his moral feeling and his legal position. Both where the law was nothing but a confirmation of long-existing manners and where entirely original, it was proposed to call forth a line of conduct in accordance with them for the future, it was considered to be most firmly established when the character of the people was accustomed to a cheerful obedience to its dictates. The moral habit (*ἔθος*) was trained up to the law, by which means an ethico-political mode of feeling (*ῥῆθος*) was produced^a; it was not intended that the laws should be raised above the state, and by the power conceded to them impart another direction to thought and will; but that a course of life closely interwoven with the law should be generated from the heart, its spirit be reflected in the disposition of the citizen, and exemplified in his actions; the moral impulses were to unite with the legal precepts, and grow into natural feeling, so that the citizen should be in no

^a ῥῆθος διὰ ἔθος, Plato Leg. 7. 792. D.; Plut. de Ser. Num. Vindic. 8. 180; Aristot. Pol. 8. 1. 1. To make laws without instilling such sentiments as these, says Plato, Repub. 4. 426. E., is like cutting off one of the Hydra's heads.

otherwise dependent upon the law than upon his own will. None of the earlier Grecian legislators supposed that it could ever become permanently established by the power of rational conviction alone without the aid of habit; the specious maxim, that every habit is a fault, inasmuch as the good must ever be the result of examination and conviction, was unknown to the Greeks; even Plato's pattern-state was especially grounded upon habit, education, and manners⁹. However, all the codes did not equally subject the activity of the reason to habit. That of Sparta required implicit¹⁰ and rigid adherence to the legal precept in the minutest concerns of life¹¹; hence, the laws were few in number¹², and brief in expression. The ordinances of Zaleucus and Charondas, form the transition to those of Solon. Solon reckoned largely upon the power of the reason in the determination of the will. His political principle was that of right; this was intended to have its foundation in the approbation of the reason; the ethical principle was not prominently developed; his numerous laws contained more legal provisions than moral ones; hence, it was requisite that the course pursued in accustoming the citizen to the laws should be in accordance with their spirit, wherefore it was less a training of the manners than of the judgment; by the daily performance of juridical functions the citizen was expected to become familiarized with

⁹ Politic. 308. D. E.; Repub. 4. 425; comp. Legg. 1. 643. A. sqq.

¹⁰ Plut. Lyc. 27.: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀργὸν οὐδ' ἀφειμένον, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι κατεμινύετο τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις ἀρετῆς τινα ζῆλον ἢ κακίας διαβολήν.

¹¹ Thucyd. 1. 84. when he says that the Spartans were ἀμαθέστεροι τῶν νόμων τῆς ὑπεροψίας παιδευόμενοι, does not express himself strongly enough.

¹² Charilaus said τοῖς χρωμένους ὀλίγοις λόγοις μὴ δεῖσθαι νόμων πολλῶν, Plut. Apoph. 6. 718.

the law. It must be confessed that there is here no trace of that depth of feeling which is nurtured by a calm observance of the moral duties; the impress of the Attic intellect is more conspicuous than that of natural feeling. The manner in which legal rather than moral forms confirmed the practical authority of the laws, will be more fully considered below¹³.

Now, as the Grecian legislators considered the most solid basis for their precepts to be a corresponding mode of feeling in the citizens, it was necessary that they should have the power of making legislative ordinances for the regulation of that feeling. In this respect the legislation of the Greeks appears in a character wholly at variance with the relation in which ethics stand to politics at the present day; for although the civil laws inculcated their precepts upon ethico-religious motives, these motives were not derived from any other source than that which was assigned to political law¹⁴, whereas the civil legislation extended itself in proportion to the demands which it made upon the ethical capacity of the citizens, made the main directions of moral and physical life dependent upon itself, and, in our opinion, committed encroachments upon the most sacred rights of persons, upon domestic privileges and private relations;

¹³ See § 47. and 48.

¹⁴ The earliest example of the foundation of an ethical mode of feeling intended to support the law, and flowing from any other source than the law itself, doubtless occurs in the *Proœmia* of Plato. See *Legg.* 4. 720, sqq.; 8. 854. D.; 9. 871. A.; 11. 927. B.; 12. 960. A.; comp. *Timæus*, 29. D. The *Proœmia* of Zaleucus and Charondas, even in their revived form, bear rather the character of commands than exhortations. See Heyne, *Opusc.* 2. 9, sqq. In *Diog. L.* 1. 60. 78, we are almost tempted to conjecture the remains of Pittacus and Solon's *Proœmia*; conf. at large Moser *Excurs.* V. *Cic. de Legg.*

moreover, in order more effectually to wind itself around the roots of ethical life, it rendered education¹⁵ the object of public concernment, but with totally different motives from those which actuate the states of the present day, and represented the laws as paramount to all this, and purely political, having nothing but an indirect connection with the divine superintendence over human affairs. But on the other hand, for the very reason that ethics were made dependent upon the positive law of the state, not one of the Grecian legislators ever considered the science in a higher point of view than a political one, and, consequently, did not extend it beyond the bounds of patriotism and legality, or conceive¹⁶ or desire to establish it in its real independence and universality. Hence it became the common aim of ethics and politics to produce civil virtue by adapting the aggregate life of the state to the laws: the state was, within its own limits, to train up its members to that perfection which was commensurate with its demands upon them; whilst its noblest attribute and nearest approach to perfection, was the power of rewarding civil virtue. This is not consistent with the narrow definition of the state as an institution of security, or as a union, by means of which personal liberty is to be placed in a just relation to civil, and the private condition of individuals to the aggregate condition of the public, whilst the ethical principle must be derived from another source, namely, reason or religion; for that very reason

¹⁵ Παιδεία, ἀγωγή.

¹⁶ Even Socrates' assertion, that he was not an Athenian nor a Greek, but κόσμιος, does not strictly imply that he was a Cosmopolite. Cicero Tuscul. 5. 37; de Legg. 1. 23; Plut. de Amor. Frater. 8. 371. Compare with what is advanced above, Zachariæ Betr. üb. Cicero de Repub. 241, sqq.

the ethics of Grecian legislation must only be considered in a political point of view. But we fully agree with those who are of opinion, that the total subjection of all the channels of ethical life to a legal standard, endangers the noblest attributes of man, viz., freedom, and the impulse to develop his natural character¹⁷.

Moreover, in harmony with the ethical tenour of the law was the antique mode of promulgating and inculcating it. For, as it once flowed from the lips of the paternal prince, as from a living fountain, into the hearts of his subjects, so now, when it had long ceased to be annexed to the person of the sovereign, it was conveyed to the feelings and impressed upon the minds of the auditory in forms of poetry and music. This was the case in Crete¹⁸ and Sparta¹⁹, and the laws of Charondas appear to have been sung as Scolia at the Athenian banquets²⁰. Thus the beautiful combination of ideas in the word *mode* or *measure*, as applied to music and morals, was expressed by the words *nomos*²¹ and *nomodos*²², and the intimate connection subsisting between music and the means taken to cultivate lawfulness of life, were amongst the principal causes which subsequently obtained for music so elevated

¹⁷ Schiller Solon's Verfass. The Grecian legislators were wrong in stimulating the moral duties by the compulsion of the laws. The primary requisite to moral beauty in the action, is the freedom of the will, and this is sacrificed as soon as it is proposed to extort moral virtue by means of legal penalties. The noblest privilege of human nature is that of judging for itself, and doing good for the sake of good.

¹⁸ Æl. V. H. 2. 39.

¹⁹ Clem. Alex. 1. 308, τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων νόμους ἐμελοποίησε Τέρπανδρος ὁ Ἀντισσαῖος.

²⁰ Hermipp. ap. Ath. 14. 619; conf. Heyne, Opusc. 2. 166. n.

²¹ Aristot. Probl. 19. 28, διὰ τί νόμοι καλοῦνται οὐς αἰδοῦσιν; ἢ ὅτι πρὶν ἐπίστασθαι γράμματα ᾗδον τοὺς νόμους, ὅπως μὴ ἐπιλάθωνται, ὥσπερ ἐν Ἀγαθύροισι ἐτι εἰώθασι;

²² Νομφῶδες, Scymn. 323; comp. Heyne, Opusc. 2. 109. n.

a rank amongst the fruits of human culture. When relations became more diversified, and intellectual development advanced, the laws were committed to writing, which, according to tradition, was first employed in legislation by Zaleucus²³; they were now publicly exhibited, engraved upon tables or hewn in columns²⁴.

Finally, in correspondence with the general character of the law was the public life of the citizens, in gymnasia, syssitia, etc.; the citizens were required to know each other as living in conformity to the law—love, unity, and confidence were to be produced by the public assimilation of thoughts and actions²⁵, so that by means of the intercourse between citizens morally allied to each other, the public mind was brought into unison with the law. From correct views as to that publicity, we shall be enabled to form a just estimate of what we might else overlook, the obligations of the citizens to watch over the integrity of the laws, and to assist, by word and deed, in denouncing their enemy²⁶. As the morality of all was intended to strengthen the law, so the vigilance of all was directed to impart security to it; this constituted a police of the noblest kind, and bore no affinity to the mercenary zeal of hirelings. The odium which usually attends the occupation of spies and informers, was lost in the joint and public nature of the service. Moreover, the police was only confided to particular functionaries in certain subordinate

²³ Strab. 6. 259; Scymn. 213; comp. Wolf. Prolegom. LXVI., sqq.

²⁴ Compare below, § 48. n. 8, on Solon's laws.

²⁵ Compare Plato, Leg. 5. 738. C.; Aristot. Pol. 5. 9. 2; Eth. Nic. 8. 1, where see Zell.

²⁶ See the law of Charondas, Stob. 42. 287; conf. Plato, Legg. 11. 907. E.

departments, and the obligation of all to perform its duties was the chief cause why the *Nomophylaces*²⁷, whose name appears to express the nature of a superior police, were in no Grecian state entrusted with correspondent duties; their attention was confined to irregularities and disturbances in the popular assembly, as in Athens²⁸; the reprimanding the contumacious, as in Locri²⁹, etc.

Thus the law became a substitute for the once-existing authority of the princes, which was based upon their possession of eminent personal qualities. This was effected, politically, through the fear of civil penalties and through public spirit; ethically, by adapting moral life to legal precepts, and through moral shame³⁰; and religiously, through reverence for the divine safeguard of political order; and thus the law obtained that force which Grecian patriots ascribe to it³¹, and which can never be derived from the bare letter. If, in spite of this, many ordinances, in accordance with the national character, had but a short existence, it must be considered that they did not originate at the first development of a system, but arose afterwards, when it was in full operation, and, consequently, impeded it, and that after the primitive manners had grown relaxed, the remedy came too late.

In the provisions made for determining the rela-

²⁷ See Cicero de Legg. 3. 20; Xenoph. Œc. 9. 14; Poll. 8. 94; Suid. νομοφ.; Columella de re Rust. 12. 3. 10; conf. Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 549; and above, § 38, n. 16.

²⁸ See § 47. n. 24. ²⁹ Stob. 42. 278.

³⁰ Αἰδώς. Compare on the subject of the Roman verecundia, Cic. de Repub. p. 300, Stuttg.

³¹ Pind. Νόμος πάντων βασιλεὺς, ap. Herod. 3. 38; conf. 7. 104. of the Spartans—ἐπεστι γάρ σφι δεσπότης νόμος, sqq.; Νόμοι πόλεως βασιλῆες, Plato Sympos. 196. C.; Pittacus ap. Diog. L. ἀρχὴ μέγιστη ἢ τοῦ ποικίλου ξύλου.

tion of morals to law, is contained the solution of that important problem in legislation, how the permanence of the law is to be reconciled with the ever-advancing development in civil and domestic affairs. The importance of this question was most assuredly not unknown to any of the ancient legislators. Neither was any one of them so narrow-minded as to think it impossible that ethical and political virtue should advance. There reigned, indeed, in the ancient Grecian way of thinking, a notion of the peculiar excellence of the olden time, of superior nobility, of purer manners in their fathers, and of a natural falling off in the later generations of mankind from the perfection of their ancestors³²; and, accordingly, the firmest possible adherence to that which was considered archaic and prescriptive, must have appeared to them a means to preclude further corruption. On the other hand, the idea that Minos amended his laws³³ every ninth year, after an interview with Zeus, and the practice of introducing new institutions for a certain period only, and experimentally, as it were, must be considered less ancient. However, in reality, Lycurgus was the only lawgiver who seems to have contemplated absolute fixity of the laws. But this appears less startling, when we take into consideration the poverty of his code in objective standards, and behold in this not so much the attempt to regulate civil life by the law, as a desire to strengthen the latter by means of the former. This proves the tradition to be unfounded, that he endeavoured

³² Nestor ap. Hom. Il. 1. 262, sqq.; Hesiod. Op. et Di. 109, sqq.

³³ Heracl. Pont. 3—ἐποιεῖτο δὲ δὲ ἐννιάτου ἔτους τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν νόμων.

to render his laws inviolate, by exacting an oath from the Spartans, that they would observe them till his return, then going into perpetual exile³⁴. But on the other hand, the history of Sparta shows what unnatural restraint was experienced when those manners, which were confirmed by Lycurgus' enactments, continued to exist, in the despotic trammels of legal forms, after the mode of feeling from which they had first emanated had passed away.

No one of these legislators, who regulated the state according to the will of the collective people, could entertain the notion of a fixed and unchangeable standard, unless, like Lycurgus, he reckoned upon a corresponding immutability in the popular feeling. The efficacy of the law was derived from the assent of the people at large³⁵. Now, although this, far from being the offspring of caprice, was the expression of a feeling in perfect unison with the laws, having its support in long-existing manners, it was, nevertheless, tacitly declared in the resolution of the people as to accepting the law, that the right of depriving it of force likewise resided in them. So far the legislator left to the body politic the unrestricted liberty of making fresh provisions for cases in which the law might be inadequate, or in order to satisfy the urgent demands of the age. This might be effected without the strict abrogation of a particular law, or the introduction of a new one, when an ordinance was framed in the form of a popular decree (*ψήφισμα*), which was only intended to apply to a

³⁴ See Manso Sparta, l. 1. 181. n.

³⁵ Харос. θέσθαι—έθηκε μὲν ὁ νομοθέτης, έθετο καὶ ὁ δῆμος.

particular case, but not to be inserted amongst the permanent laws. If this, on the one hand, when confined within proper bounds, appears as the due mean between the permanence of the law and the claims of development, it might easily degenerate into abuse whenever the principle was asserted, that it was necessary to regard, as law, the latest expression of the popular will³⁶. If, therefore, it was laid down as a general principle, that the duration of the laws was dependent upon the popular feeling, it was, in especial, necessary to provide against a possibility, that whilst that unison subsisted upon the whole, the effect of precipitancy or passion might expose them to danger³⁷. In Sparta, the young men were forbidden to censure the laws³⁸. Zaleucus and Charondas awarded punishment to inconsiderate expressions of a wish for innovation³⁹, and declared an attempt to propose new laws a capital crime⁴⁰. On the other hand, Solon is asserted to have exacted an oath for the observance of his laws, for a limited number of years only⁴¹. These three gradations at least correspond with the respective degrees in which the three codes subjected manners to the law. But the Solonic institution of the *Nomothetæ*⁴² decidedly proclaimed the principle, that the laws should not be stationary⁴³, as attempts at change were not only permitted, but legally enjoined.

³⁶ See Wolf ad Demosth. Lept. 310.

³⁷ Comp. Hüllmann, Staatsr. d. Alt. 304; Tittmann, griech. Staatsv. 525.

³⁸ Plato de Legg. 1. 634. E.

³⁹ Concerning the punishment awarded to any one who asked μή τι καινόν, see Plut. de Curios. 8. 61. 62.

⁴⁰ Stob. 42. 277; conf. Polyb. 12. 7; Diod. 12. 17; Bekker, Anecd. 220.

⁴¹ Ten years in Herod. 1. 29; a hundred in Plut. Sol. 25; Gell. 2. 12; conf. Meurs. Sol. 25.

⁴² See § 47. n. 56. § 48. init.

⁴³ Plut. Sept. Sap. Conviv. 6. 576--τοὺς νόμους ὁ Σόλων ἔφη μετακινη-
τοὺς εἶναι.

III. FUNDAMENTAL LAWS OF CONSTITUTIONS GENERALLY.

§ 41. Thus far extends the exposition of that which is common to Grecian laws of every kind; especial consideration must now be devoted to those by which constitutions were framed, in contradistinction to such as only contained provisions for the direction of civil life¹. But this requires to be preceded by a general survey. A glance at the pretended codes of the heroic age proves that with the exception of that of ancient Athens, to which the name of Theseus is annexed, they could have been nothing more than a body of public regulations. Without enumerating the mythical progenitors of a people who are commemorated as legislators, or their immediate successors, such as Phoroneus, Apis, Triptolemus², Macareus on Lesbos³, and Tennes on Tenedos⁴; we may here mention the code of Minos, a collection of ordinances for the regulation of the state, which maintained their ground under the constitution which succeeded the kingly government; the laws of Rhadamanthus the judge and guardian of the ordinances of Minos⁵; these included a few institutes of very remote antiquity, such as the oath⁶, the

¹ The ancients called the former *πολιτεία*, the latter *νόμοι*. See Isocrat. Paneg. cap. 10.: *νόμους ἔθετο καὶ πολιτείαν κατέστησε*. Conf. Aristot. Pol. 2. 9. 1. 9; 3. 10. 3; 4. 1. 5; Plato de Legg. 4. 712. E.; 5. 735. A. To the same effect is Plato de Legg. 4. 709. A.: *νομοθεσία καὶ πόλεων κατοικισμοί*. The relation in which the works of the political writers who employ those terms, stand to each other, cannot be treated of till afterwards.

² See the list in Fabric. bibl. Gr. ed. Harl. 2. 28, sqq.

³ Diod. 5. 82. ⁴ Heracl. Pont. 3; Zenob. 6. 9; Suid. *Τενέδιος*.

⁵ Ps. Plato Minos, 320. C. Talos is there named with him.

⁶ Schol. Aristoph. Av. 524; Porphy. de Abstin. 3. 36; Hesych. Phot. Suid. *Ῥαδάμάνθους ὄρκος*.

rendering self-defence⁷ and retaliation lawful⁸, etc. Some degree of mythical obscurity still involves the names of Onomacritus⁹, and Thaletas the singer¹⁰, the friend of Lycurgus; if their existence rests on an historical foundation, it may be safely asserted, that their profound knowledge of the art of legislation, extolled by Aristotle, was displayed in the age of the poets and statesmen alluded to above. Amongst the legislators for civil life in the heroic age are commemorated the Argive king Phidon, who regulated weights and measures in the Peloponnesus¹¹; Pittacus, who when Æsymnete in Lesbos restored the constitution which had been impaired by dissension¹², but whose laws merely embodied a few maxims of morality and natural justice¹³; Androdamas from Rhegium, who gave laws respecting heiresses¹⁴ to the Thracian Chalcidians, and perhaps was the author of that which declared that no citizen under fifty years of age should be a magistrate¹⁵; Draco in Athens, who, besides making penal laws¹⁶, established certain rules for the conduct of judicial proceedings¹⁷. Amongst the former, the prohibition of a proposal to alter a law on pain of Atimia¹⁸ bears a more general character.

The ordinances regulating the property of the citizens, and the right to a participation in the

⁷ Apoll. 2. 4. 9.

⁸ Aristot. Eth. Nic. 5. 5; conf. Neumann rer. Cretic. Spec. cap. 4.

⁹ Aristot. Pol. 2. 9. 5.

¹⁰ Ibid. and Suid. Θαλήτας ῥαψωδός. Sext. Empir. adv. Mathemat. 63. B. attributes to him a law against the Sophists.

¹¹ Herod. 6. 127; conf. Müller, Ægin. 55, sqq.

¹² Strab. 13. 617; Diog. L. 1. 74.

¹³ Aristot. Pol. 2. 9. 9.

¹⁴ Ibid. ubi sup.

¹⁵ Heracl. Pont. 30.

¹⁶ Aristot. Pol. ubi sup.; conf. Gell. Noct. Att. 11. 18; Suid. Δράκων.

¹⁷ Conf. § 45. n. 30.

¹⁸ Demosth. C. Aristocr. 640.

supreme power which was dependent upon it, must be reckoned amongst the fundamental laws of the constitution. Such were the ordinances of the princes as to the relation between land and population in the states founded after the Doric migration, e. g. that made by Oxylus to prevent the mortgaging estates¹⁹. Of a similar character were the laws of the Corinthian Phidon, as to the numerical proportion between the landed estates and the citizens²⁰; those of the Bacchiad Philolaus²¹, who with his favourite Diocles the Megarian²², went to Thebes, and there amongst various other laws promulgated one on the subject of adoption, which was intended to maintain equality in the number of the estates²³; and those of the Cumæan Phidon, who, amongst others, enacted that whoever could keep a horse should have a share in the government²⁴.

Cleobulus is said to have been the lawgiver of the Rhodian town Lindus²⁵; the aristocratic government of that place was undoubtedly more ancient than his institutions; it is possible, as was before remarked²⁶, that he mitigated its character. The laws of Charondas, adopted by his native town Catana and several Chalcidian states, as well as by Rhegium²⁷, were only distinguished by the exactness of their provisions²⁸. Connected with the

¹⁹ Aristot. Pol. 6. 2. 5.²⁰ Ibid. 2. 3. 7.²¹ Ibid. 2. 9. 7.²² On a Megarian hero Diocles, see Aristoph. Ach. 774. and Schol.; conf. Plut. Thes. 10.²³ Aristot. ubi sup. ἵνα ὁ ἀριθμὸς σώζεται τῶν κλήρων. Conf. Müller, Orch. 407.²⁴ Heracl. Pont. 11.²⁵ Plut. de ei 7. 514; Clem. Alex. Strom. 4. 523. B.; conf. Diog. L. 1. 89, sqq.²⁶ See § 35. n. 15.²⁷ Arist. Pol. 2. 9. 5; conf. Heyne Opusc. 2. 158, sqq.²⁸ Aristot. Pol. 2. 9. 8.

regulation of the supreme power is the law which authorized every citizen to sit in judgment²⁹. Zaleucus the legislator of the Italian Locri, probably did not organize the constitution in all its departments; his object was, to maintain an equality of property amongst the citizens³⁰, and he appointed definite punishments in lieu of arbitrary sentences³¹; he likewise instituted several political authorities, the Cosmopolis³², the Nomophylaces³³, and even the council of a thousand³⁴; but the enactment by which he declared an attempt to propose new laws a capital offence³⁵, ranks higher than the constitutions themselves. Fundamental laws of the constitution, in the strict sense of the term, were framed by Demonax the Mantinean in Cyrene; of whom it is recorded, that he instituted three Phylæ, committed to the people the supreme power, assigned demesnes to the king, and annexed the high-priesthood to his office, but confined the royal prerogative within very narrow bounds³⁶; this was of course attended by the appointment of a council and appropriate officers.

The laws of Lycurgus, Solon, and Clisthenes demand more minute enquiry; the consideration of the last two must be preceded by an examination of the ancient Attic constitution attributed to Theseus; but it is first necessary to devote a

²⁹ Aristot. Pol. 4. 10. 7.

³⁰ Ibid. 2. 4. 4: unless great losses had been sustained, the sale of real property was not allowed.

³¹ Ephor. ap. Strab. 6. 260. This is ascribed to Charondas, Diodor. 12. 16. who, in treating of these two, and Diocles the Syracusan, frequently transfers certain particulars from the one to the other.—*Ζαλεῦκου νόμος* became proverbial for a severe law. See Zenob. 4. 10; Diogenian, 4. 94.

³² Polyb. 2. 16. 10. 11.

³³ Stob. 278. 18.

³⁴ Polyb. ubi sup.

³⁵ See § 40. n. 39.

³⁶ Herod. 4. 161, sqq.; Arist. Pol. 6. 2. 11.

few words to the spirit in which these codes regulated the classes and the supreme power in general.

Not one of the Grecian legislators was so entirely superior to the injustice exhibited in the habitual treatment of those who were not citizens, as wholly to abolish slavery in his dominions, and render all classes of society partakers of those rights to which they were equally entitled as men. That for a long time there were no slaves in the Italian Locri³⁷, must not be attributed as a merit to Zaleucus. His humanity was satisfied with affording unfortunate servants precarious protection against excessive cruelty in their masters. Not even the barrier between Perioeci and entire citizens was completely removed; consequently the operation of the laws which concerned the civic body was still confined to those who were possessed of the full rights of citizenship. But in this class, the best title to whose privileges the legislators considered to be conferred by birth, the various codes agreed in making the relation in which all classes of citizens stood to the law, uniform and immediate, and thus abolished all previous relations amongst the orders. In the same manner they all required, as an external qualification, permanent residence, and the possession of an estate; every citizen was required to have a home, a domestic hearth to defend, and thus in the relations of private life to become directly acquainted with duty and justice. But in the conjunction of right and property there was a twofold valuation, and this produced two regulations of the classes, which materially differed from each other. In the

³⁷ § 33. n. 6.

first, which was with more or less strictness contemplated by Lycurgus, Phidon, Philolaus, and Zaleucus, property, and in the nature of things the landed property of individuals, was as nearly as possible reduced to equality; precedence was not given to riches, but to personal worth and virtue, and thus it was attempted to repress the pernicious tendency of the Grecian character to gain. The citizens, all equally endowed by the state with that which the satisfaction of human necessities required, were in return obliged to dedicate to it their whole energy and power; and as this secured to the state a firm bulwark, and a living mine, in estimating the efforts and the merit of an individual, regard was only had to the exact measure of his real worth. Thus life was reduced to its simplest elements, and every thing was made dependent upon the strength and virtue inherent in the citizen. The other census introduced by Solon distributed obligations and rights according to the gradations of property; this enabled the citizen to assert those accidental advantages of fortune to which his merits in other respects might bear no proportion, his possessions being thrown into the scale together with his personal qualities. This notion, which involved the principle, that he who had most at stake would of necessity be most deeply interested in the welfare of the state, was moreover based upon a thorough knowledge of the Grecian character, whose predominant characteristic was the most ungovernable cupidity: the attempt wholly to overcome it had been abandoned in despair. A middle course was now pursued; and perhaps no one of the wise men of antiquity

was so deeply impressed with the conviction that such a course was the best, as Solon³⁸. Upon this principle a degree of importance could to a certain extent be attained even by the lowest order, whilst the first system, which established one unvarying measure of external qualifications, perpetuated the degradation of all who fell short of the standard of full citizenship.

The regulation of the political authorities under the various codes possessed this feature in common, that the supreme power was vested in the general body, and not in a single order; the remaining provisions, relating to the election of the council and the functionaries, and the extent of their official power, as well as the dependence of the popular assembly upon the council, etc., are the peculiar features which imparted to the individual constitutions a character more or less aristocratic or democratic, and on this account the four codes in question must be considered separately.

IV. THE FUNDAMENTAL LAWS OF THE SPARTAN AND ATHENIAN CONSTITUTIONS.

a. The Constitution of Lycurgus.

§ 42. The accounts of the life and institutions¹ of Lycurgus are evidently mythical, and their date uncertain². The doubts which have been raised as to his historical existence may perhaps be unfounded; but there can be no doubt that much,

³⁸ On the subject of the attempts to counteract the influence of money, consult Hüllmann, Staatsr. d. Alterth. 203; Müll. Dor. 2. 11.

¹ See an enumeration of the sources, with an estimate of their respective authenticity, Manso, Sparta, v. 1. Append. vi. p. 63, sqq.

² See Manso, v. 1. 71. n.; Müller, Dor. 1. 132, sqq.

which bears his name, had existed before his time, and was only confirmed by him, whilst a great deal more was constructed upon the groundwork he laid. Therefore, even supposing his code to have contained more than the three well-known rhetras³, it is by no means a matter of surprise, that Hellanicus should ascribe the constitution of Sparta to Eurysthenes and Procles⁴, and make no mention whatever of Lycurgus; and that opinion is continually gaining ground, which in the main regards Lycurgus as the regulator of existing institutions, and in particular instances only as the author of original laws⁵.

The population of Laconia had, before the time of Lycurgus, been divided into Spartans, Lacedæmonians, and Helots⁶, in successive stages of development. The collisions between the Doric Spartans and the Achæans, who had remained in the country in by no means inconsiderable numbers, the Ægidæ, and the Minyan settlers, occasioned several migrations of the non-Dorians⁷. These gave the Dorians, of whom only one colony emigrated to Tarentum, a firmer and a more commanding position, and increased their desire to become absolute masters of the country; but the Achæans resisted. In this manner an infraction of the treaty which had at first been concluded with

³ Plut. Lyc. 6; comp. Agesil. 26; Fleischessen 10. 149; comp. Müll. Dor. 1. 134. 135; and above, § 40. n. 3.

⁴ Ephor. ap Strab. 8. 366.

⁵ Comp. Müll. Dor. 2. 14, sqq.

⁶ Herod. 6. 58. 2. It is, however, unnecessary to adduce examples to prove that the word Lacedæmonians frequently occurs as the general appellation, instead of Spartans.

⁷ Ægidæ and Minyans under Theras to Thera, Herod. 4. 148; Paus. 4. 33; Minyans to Triphylia, Herod. ubi sup.; Achæans to Patræ, Paus. 3. 2. 1; 7. 6. 2; 18. 3; to Melos and Crete under Pollis and Delphos, Conon 36. 47; to Crotona, Paus. 3. 3. 1; 3. 2. 6.

them, and which secured to them equal rights with the Dorians⁸, took place on both sides. Some of the Achæan towns, Amyclæ, Ægys, Pharis, Geronthræ, Helos⁹, etc., were subdued by force, and their inhabitants reduced to slavery, and denominated Helots¹⁰. A more lenient fate attended those whose resistance had been less obstinate; they were named half-citizens, Lacedæmonians or Pericæci, and the relation in which the Doric full-citizens in Sparta stood to them, was of an aristocratic nature¹¹.

Before the time of Lycurgus the best tillage-land had been divided into equal allotments, according to the number of the Spartans. There were afterwards nine thousand estates¹². The men of Sparta, in its most flourishing days, amounted to eight or ten thousand¹³. The circle of these full citizens, thus qualified with regard to property, and by means of such an education as the law prescribed, endowed with martial virtue, was most rigorously closed against inferior persons and aliens¹⁴, and accessible to the genuine aristocracy of merit only, i. e., to those citizens who fulfilled the law with the greatest punctuality and cheerfulness; at the same time, the Heraclid hereditary nobility

⁸ Ephor. ap. Strab. 8. 364; compare above, § 32. n. 18.

⁹ Paus. 3. 2. 5—7.

¹⁰ According to Ephor. ap. Strab. 8. 365, all the Laconian Achæans were at first called Helots, and the war against them was named the Helot war. But in this instance the word has a retrospective force; it signifies subjection by force of arms (conf. § 34. n. 1), and does not apply to the Achæans as long as they were *ισόνομοι*.

¹¹ Ephor. ubi sup. In the account of Isocrates, Panath. 460. 461, the true facts cannot be recognised.

¹² Manso, Sparta, 1. 1. 109, sqq.

¹³ Herod. 7. 234; Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 12.

¹⁴ Compare § 33. n. 22. According to Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 12, the rights of citizenship were frequently conferred under the first kings. This, probably, refers to those bestowed upon the Achæans, Ægidæ, and Minyans.

was preserved in the utmost purity in the royal line¹⁵, and in certain families allied to the royal house¹⁶. The Homoioi¹⁷, who, when the constitution began to degenerate, were contradistinguished as ancient citizens from the Neodamodes, etc., were, in the earlier age, mere citizens, who were deficient in none of the honour of citizenship, in opposition to the dishonourable and the infamous¹⁸, and perhaps to the Epeunactæ, a class of new citizens, composed of the Helots¹⁹, emancipated in the Messenian war. The noble band of the three hundred knights, selected from the ranks of the young men, composed a body destined to attend the king; and from this were again annually singled out five Agathoergoi, as the ever-ripening fruit of civil virtue²⁰. In general, rights and authority increased with age²¹. At thirty, a person was entitled to attend the popular assembly²², and at sixty, eligible to the council²³.

Gradations of other descriptions, as occurring in a later age, will be mentioned in a subsequent portion of the present work.

The Lacedæmonians or Perioeci²⁴, to whom, like the Spartans, had been apportioned thirty thousand lots of land²⁵, which corresponded with their number, were endowed with rights in their

¹⁵ Ephors guarded the queen at the time of her delivery, Herod. 5. 41; Plat. Alcib. 1. 121. B. It was unlawful for a king to marry a foreign woman, Plat. Agis. 11. ¹⁶ Herod. 6. 57; Plut. Lysand. 2.

¹⁷ Xenoph. Hell. 3. 3. 4—11, and Schneid. ad eund. § 5; 5. 3. 9; de Repub. Laced. 10. 7; Demosth. in Lept. 489.

¹⁸ Ἀδόκιμοι, ἄτιμοι, Xenoph. de Repub. Lac. 3. 3.

¹⁹ Theopomp. ap. Ath. 6. 271. D. and comp. above, § 33. n. 32.

²⁰ Herod. 1. 67; 8. 124; Thuc. 5. 72; Xen. de Repub. Lac. 4. 3.

²¹ Plut. an Seni Respub., etc. 9. 177—ἐν Λακεδαίμονι κάλλιστα γηρῶσι.

²² Plut. Lyc. 25.

²³ Plut. Lyc. 21.

²⁴ Herod. 6. 58; Ephor. ap. Strab. 8. 364.

²⁵ Plut. Lyc. 8.

private capacity, and unrestricted in trade, and in this respect were more highly privileged than the Spartans themselves; but as a body they were subordinate to them²⁶, and excluded from a participation in the full rights of citizenship²⁷; they paid a tribute to the state²⁸, and were liable to be summoned with the Spartans to the defence of their country²⁹. Political duties of a superior nature were not confided to them till some time afterwards.

The Helots were serfs, and as many as were not immediately required by the state³⁰, belonged, together with the single estates, to individual Spartans³¹, but under such limitations, that they might at any time be claimed as public property. Lycurgus, probably, did not deem their condition worthy of much attention. We know of no institution for their protection. The notorious Helot chase, the *Crypteia*³², seems to have been continued from the time of the earlier wars against the Achæans, as a military exercise with sharp weapons, wherein it is highly probable that the unhappy Helots frequently fell victims to the outrages committed by

²⁶ *Συντελεῖς*, Eph. ubi sup. They followed the corpse of a king, *χωρὶς Σπαρτηγέων* (Herod. 6. 58; comp. the Comment. on 7. 234; 9. 11.), that is, in a separate procession? Compare on the obligation of the Megarians to appear at the obsequies of a Bacchiad, § 26. n. 58.

²⁷ Were they admitted to the popular assembly? The passage cited by Tittmann, griech. Staatsv. p. 89, viz. Plut. Lyc. 6. and 25, do not expressly say so; the contrary, however, cannot be demonstrated from Thucyd. 1. 80, *ἀστυγέιτονας*, but it may be gathered from it indirectly, conf. Müll. Dor. 2. 24.

²⁸ This may be inferred from the tributes of the Messenians, who were placed upon the footing of Periceci after the first war, Paus. 4. 14. 3.

²⁹ Five thousand Spartan and the same number of Lacedæmonian Hoplitæ fought at Plataeæ.

³⁰ Ephor. ap. Strab. ubi sup.; Paus. 3. 20. 6; Plut. Lyc. 2.

³¹ Müll. Dor. 2. 34, sqq.

³² Aristot. ap. Plut. Lyc. 28; Heracl. Pont. 3; Isocrat. Panath. 462. The lenient description of Plat. de Legg. 1. 633. B. may be estimated at its real worth from a similar one in Protag. 342. C.—“the Xenelasia—an institution formed to enable persons to philosophise without being disturbed,” conf. Plut. Lyc. 20. ad fin. 31.

the young warriors, which doubtless often went unpunished. On this subject, as in the remaining accounts of the mal-treatment of the Helots³³, the acts of individuals which were wholly unconnected with political objects, are ascribed to the state, and with the most unwarrantable distortion of truth, sometimes represented as the express aim of legislation³⁴. In war they accompanied their masters³⁵ as pages. Part of them had been brought up with them from their infancy; these were denominated Mothones or Mothaces³⁶, and ceased to belong to the servile order; they were likewise occasionally enfranchised for their fidelity in war³⁷.

The regulation of the supreme power must, according to the relation subsisting between the three classes of inhabitants, as already described, be regarded only as the private statute of the full citizens; and when the legislation of Lycurgus is said to have been occasioned by lawless dissension³⁸, this must not be understood as referring to the position of the Spartans in relation to the Periœci and Helots, but to discord amongst the first alone, especially between the two royal houses³⁹ and their adherents. The stability of the legal ordinances, the disposition of the people, who, steadfastly adhering to their immutable moral principle of action, ceased to be conscious of the power inherent in their own body to make what-

³³ Theopomp. ap. Ath. 6. 272. A.; Myron. ap. Ath. 14. 657; concerning his Acrisia, conf. Paus. 4. 6. 2; Plut. Lyc. 28.

³⁴ Aristot. ap. Plut. Lyc. 28. doubts whether the Crypteia was Lycurgan.

³⁵ Herod. 9. 28; 7. 229.

³⁶ Plut. Cleom. 8; Æl. V. H. 12. 43; Phylarch. ap. Ath. 6. 271. E.; Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 279.

³⁷ The name *ἑρκετῆρες* more especially refers to the preservation and care of wounded men and the charge of the corpses.

³⁸ Herod. 1. 65; Isocrat. Panath. 459. ed. Lange; Plut. Lyc. 2.

³⁹ Thuc. 1. 18.

ever changes in the laws they thought proper, and their cheerful acquiescence in their dependence upon the magistrates⁴⁰, who were accounted the best in the state, and the living fountain of legal order, caused the legislative power of the people to be so completely eclipsed by the executive of the officers⁴¹; so that what in reality appertained to the one is so frequently ascribed to the other.

According to the strictly aristocratic principle, the Geronia took precedence of the popular assembly. The Geronia was composed of the two kings, who were its presidents, and twenty-eight men⁴², chosen by the people from amongst the most virtuous⁴³ members of the state⁴⁴, of at least sixty years of age⁴⁵, who were elected for life⁴⁶, and irresponsible in office⁴⁷. Besides the most important part of their official duty, which was to prepare state matters for the popular assembly⁴⁸, and to direct the administration in general, they had, in conjunction with the Ephors, to watch over the public morals⁴⁹, and with the officers of state constituted the highest court of judicature⁵⁰. The kings voted in the same manner as every other geron⁵¹, and in the absence of a king, his nearest relation⁵².

⁴⁰ It is very justly observed by Nicol. Damasc. (522 Vales. exc., 156 Orell): *σεμνύνονται δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῷ ταπεινῷ αὐτοῦ παρέχειν καὶ κατηκόους ταῖς ἀρχαῖς.*

⁴¹ *Τὰ τέλη.* See examp. Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 93. n. 20. 106.

⁴² Plut. Lyc. 5.

⁴³ Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 15: *ἀθλον ἢ ἀρχὴν αὐτῇ τῆς ἀρετῆς.*

⁴⁴ The peculiar designation *οἱ πρεσβυγενεῖς*, occurs in Plut. Lyc. 6. et Ibid. an Seni respub. etc. 9. 155.

⁴⁵ Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 15; Plut. Lyc. 26.

⁴⁶ Polyb. 6. 45.

⁴⁷ Aristot. Pol. 2. 6. 17.

⁴⁸ Plut. Lyc. 6; Agis, 8. 9. 11.

⁴⁹ Gell. Noct. Att. 18. 3.

⁵⁰ Plut. Lyc. 26; Xenoph. de Repub. Lac. 10. 2.

⁵¹ Herod. 6. 57. On the question whether each king had one vote or two (Thucyd. 1. 20.), see Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 117, 121. n. 88; Müll. Dor. 2. 102.

⁵² Herod. ubi sup.

The popular assembly⁵³ met in pursuance of a Lycurgan rhetra at stated periods⁵⁴, between the brook Cnacion and the bridge Babyca⁵⁵; it determined by an acclamation of assent or dissent⁵⁶, consequently without debating⁵⁷, on what the Geronia submitted to it, that is, on peace and war, new laws, and the appointment of public officers. The administration of justice was not amongst its duties. It continued to be refractory after the time of Lycurgus, but was entirely brought under control by the law of Polydorus or Theopompus, which invested the king and the Geronia with power to dissolve it in case it should be bent on passing mischievous resolutions⁵⁸. The small assembly⁵⁹, as it was termed, was apparently unknown to the earlier age, and afterwards denoted a meeting of all the public officers and a species of civic deputies⁶⁰.

The kings, sprung from the two Heraclid lines of Eurysthenes and Procles, succeeded to the government by right of primogeniture⁶¹; their chief marks of distinction were their place of residence⁶², demesnes⁶³, tributes of sacrificial victims⁶⁴, hides⁶⁵, and spoil⁶⁶, particular honour at

⁵³ 'Ο δᾶμος, Plut. Lyc. 6; Ibid. δημόται ἄνδρες, from Tyrtæus.

⁵⁴ Ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας, Plut. Lyc. 6, is obscure.

⁵⁵ Plut. ubi sup.

⁵⁶ Thuc. 1. 87.

⁵⁷ The passage in Plut. Præcept. reipub. gerend. 9. 196, where δημηγοροῦντος must be read instead of τινὸς Δημοσθένους, from Æschin. in Tim. 173, to the effect that a citizen had spoken in the assembly, probably refers to an irregularity of later times.

⁵⁸ Plut. Lyc. 6.

⁵⁹ Xenoph. Hell. 3. 3. 8: τὴν μικρὰν καλουμένην ἐκκλησίαν.

⁶⁰ Ἐκκληῖται, Xenoph. Hell. 2. 4. 38; 5. 2. 33; 6. 3. 3.

⁶¹ Herod. 5. 42; Paus. 3. 3. 8; Comp. Müll. Dor. 2. 101.

⁶² Plut. Agesil. 10; Xenoph. Ages. 8.

⁶³ Xenoph. Respub. Lac. 15. 3. Thence the βασιλικοὶ φόροι, Plato, Alcib. 1. 123 A.

⁶⁴ Herod. 6. 56; Xenoph. ubi sup. 15. 5.

⁶⁵ Herod. ubi sup.

⁶⁶ Herod. 9. 81; Polyb. 2. 62. 1. Like the Ἀήψεις, Plat. ubi sup.

the public banquet⁶⁷, and the solemnities attending their obsequies⁶⁸. In the range of their duties⁶⁹ they were transcripts of the heroic princes, high-priests of the worship of the Lacedæmonian and celestial Zeus⁷⁰, and, in conjunction with the Pythii, directors of the concerns of the oracle⁷¹, commanders⁷² in war, and judges in those matters most closely connected with the physical existence of the state, namely, the maintenance of families and the law of inheritance, therefore supreme guardians⁷³. But their prerogative was narrowly limited; every month they took an oath to govern according to the laws⁷⁴; they were liable to be called to account after a campaign⁷⁵; the Ephors took cognizance of their acts in minor matters⁷⁶, and in affairs of magnitude the high court of the Gerontes and Ephors⁷⁷.

The Ephors, five men chosen from the ranks of the people⁷⁸, were, according to one statement, appointed by Lycurgus⁷⁹, and according to another by Theopompus⁸⁰; but it is probable that they were created neither by the one nor the other, as has been stated, for the purpose of limiting the

⁶⁷ Herod. 6. 57.

⁶⁸ Herod. 6. 58.

⁶⁹ The distinction between the βασιλεύειν of the kings, and the ἄρχειν of the officers, is evident from Herod. 6. 67. On the οἱ ἐν τέλει see Append. xiv.

⁷⁰ Herod. 6. 55; Xenoph. Hell. 3. 3. 4.

⁷¹ Herod. ubi sup.; Cic. de divin. 1. 43.

⁷² Herod. ubi sup. Hence Ἀρχαγέται, Plut. Lyc. 6, and Βάγοι, Hesych. With that were connected the care of the roads and the *proxenia*. Herod. ubi sup.

⁷³ Herod. ubi sup.; Poll. 3. 33.

⁷⁴ Xenoph. Respub. Lac. 13. 7; Nic. Damasc. 158 Orell.; Stobæus 42. 305.

⁷⁵ Herod. 6. 85. They proposed to deliver up king Leotychides to appease the Æginetans.

⁷⁶ Plut. Ages. 2. 5.

⁷⁷ Herod. 6. 85; Xen. Hell. 3. 5. 25.

⁷⁸ Arist. Pol. 2. 6. 14. Without doubt from the ὁμοίοις, therefore afterwards oligarchical. I cannot concur in the opinion of Götting, ad Aristot. Pol. 466, that there were originally ten ephors.

⁷⁹ Herod. 1. 65; Xenoph. Respub. Lac. 8. 3.

⁸⁰ Arist. Pol. 5. 9. 1; Plut. Lyc. 7; Cleom. 10; Cic. de Repub. 2. 33; de Legg. 3. 7, etc.; comp. Manso, Sp. 1. 1. 243.

royal authority, and thereby rendering it more durable; nor were they abolished by a royal law, but appear to have been magistrates charged with the administration of civil justice in the earliest ages, and confirmed in these duties by Lycurgus⁸¹; but about the time of the first Messenian war⁸², in consequence of the absence of the kings and the majority of the citizens, they stepped forward with greater boldness as the judicial substitutes of the former⁸³: soon afterwards, and perhaps in pursuance of express convention, upon the allayment of the tumult by Terpander⁸⁴, they became the representatives of the people, and like the Roman tribunes, imparted an offensive character to official power, which in the first instance had been merely defensive, by exercising an inquisitorial control over the actions of magistrates and citizens collectively. This augmentation of their power is partly to be explained from the peculiar tendency of the Spartan magistrates to raise themselves above the people, and the means they possessed to extend their encroachments over so wide a field, whilst, from the absence of positive enactments, the rule of law frequently resided within their own body as an emanation from the legislative power, to the exercise of which the people daily grew more indifferent. Their character, as representatives of the people, is strikingly exemplified by the fact, that the kings swore the constitutional oath to them, they giving them a popular guarantee for the security of their govern-

⁸¹ See corresponding opinions in Tittmann, 104; Müller, 2. 112.

⁸² Comp. Corsini fasti Att. v. 3. p. 9.

⁸³ Plut. Cleom. 10.

⁸⁴ Ol. 33. 4; Diodor. Fragm. v. 4. 37; Bipont. Zenob. 5. 9, where see Schott.

ment⁸⁵; besides which, they consulted the heavens every nine years on the subject of the royal authority⁸⁶. This power could scarcely have been conceded to them otherwise than by a formal decree of the people. Still more important was their mission as watchful substitutes of the law itself⁸⁷; selected from the body of the sovereign people, whereby they ranked as censors and judges above kings and people at once, with a power which the Roman tribunes never possessed, they having endeavoured to attain their highest aims by proposing laws, whilst the Ephors represented the laws themselves. On that account they were only responsible to their successors in office⁸⁸, and that imparts a peculiar significance to their dwelling beside the temple of Fear⁸⁹. Their functions comprised the superintendence of public morals⁹⁰, with the right to impose fines, and exact immediate payment of them⁹¹; all matters connected with strangers⁹², education⁹³, the scrutiny of magistrates⁹⁴, whom they might censure, accuse, or suspend⁹⁵; and their power in certain cases even extended to imprisoning the kings⁹⁶. This was associated with the conduct of public proceedings

⁸⁵ Xen. Lac. Resp. 15. 7.

⁸⁶ Plut. Agis 11.

⁸⁷ Hence their edict upon taking office, *προσέχειν τοῖς νόμοις*, Plut. Cleom. 9; Ibid. de Sera Num. vindict. 8. 174.

⁸⁸ Plut. Agis 12.

⁸⁹ Plut. Cleom. 9.

⁹⁰ To this head must be referred the significant injunction in their edict, *κείρεσθαι τὸν μύστακα*, Plut. Cleom. 9; comp. Müll. Dor. 2. 125. See other instances in Tittmann, Griech. Staatsv. 109—111.

⁹¹ Xenoph. Lac. Resp. 8. 4.

⁹² See an example of Xenelasia, Herod. 3. 148.

⁹³ Xenoph. Lac. Resp. 4. 3. 6; Athen. 12. 550; Æl. V. H. 3. 10; 14. 7.

⁹⁴ Arist. Pol. 2. 6. 17; Xen. Lac. Resp. 8. 4. Still the Gerontes were almost inviolable.

⁹⁵ See Herod. 6. 82, concerning the accusation of Cleomenes.

⁹⁶ Thuc. 1. 131; Corn. Nep. Paus. 2—5; Xen. Lac. Resp. 8. 4. only has *ἄρχοντας*.

and the charge of foreign affairs⁹⁷, amongst which the sending of the Scytale⁹⁸ occupies a prominent position. The superintendence of certain sacrifices of the Chalcioikos⁹⁹ was by no means unimportant; the inspection of the treasury¹⁰⁰, however, is probably to be assigned to a later period.

All other magistrates were insignificant in comparison with the Ephors; none of them had any share in the chief power; the Nomophylaces¹⁰¹ were, as already stated, unimportant; the Pythii, the assistants of the kings in oracular concerns¹⁰², the five Bidiæi¹⁰³, and the Pædonomos¹⁰⁴, directed public education; the Harmosyni¹⁰⁵ watched over female continence, the five Empelori¹⁰⁶ had the care of the market, the Polemarch¹⁰⁷ attended to military affairs, and partly to the Syssitia, and the Harmosts were governors in foreign dependencies¹⁰⁸.

b. The Constitution of Athens.

(a a). Before Solon.

I. THE FOUR PHYLÆ.

§ 43. On the subject of the Athenian constitution before Solon, besides the scanty statements of the progressive changes in the archonship,

⁹⁷ Thuc. 1. 87; Plut. Ages. 9.

⁹⁸ This subject will be treated in the second volume.

⁹⁹ Polyb. 4. 35. 2.

¹⁰⁰ Tittmann, Griech. Staatsv. 115; Müller, Dor. 2. 125.

¹⁰¹ Paus. 3. 11. 2.

¹⁰² Herod. 6. 57; Phot. Ποιθιοι.

¹⁰³ Paus. 3. 11. 2.

¹⁰⁴ Xen. Lac. Resp. 2. 2; Plut. Lyc. 17.

¹⁰⁵ Hesych. ἀρμόσυννοι.

¹⁰⁶ Hesych. ἐμπελ.

¹⁰⁷ Plut. Lyc. 12.

¹⁰⁸ One of Fourmont's inscriptions in the Mém. de l'Acad. d. Inscript. 15. 417. contains most of the above titles, as well as a Harmost of the territory of Thyra.

there is an account of a division of the inhabitants of Attica into four Phylæ, called Geleontes or Teleontes, Hopletes, Aigicoreis, and Argadeis, or Ergadeis¹, and contemporaneously with this into three orders called Eupatridæ, Geomori, and Demiurgi²; and lastly, of a threefold sub-division of the Phylæ, viz., as will afterwards be shown, into the three classes above mentioned, Eupatridæ, etc., Phratrias and families, and Trittyes and Naucrarias³. There is no doubt that researches on this subject must go back to the infancy of the Athenian state, and that this relation of the inhabitants of Attica to each other was of very remote antiquity.

In late years an opinion has become prevalent, that the relation of the Phylæ to each other was one of castes⁴. A peculiar way of life in each of them, the characteristic mark of a caste-like gradation of orders, and seldom found without extensively contributing to produce inequality amongst the inhabitants of a country, is unquestionably expressed by the names of the Phylæ; and there can be no doubt, that the difference in personal importance amongst the earliest inhabitants of Attica, very soon led to the assertion of the rights of classes. But no gradation of classes of any de-

¹ Herod. 5 66; Eurip. Ion. 1566, sqq.; Plut. Sol. 23; Str. 8. 388; Pollux 8. 109; Steph. Byz. *Αἰγικόρειος* (*Αἰγικόρειος*).

² Diodor. 1. 28; Plut. Thes. 25; Poll. 8. 111.

³ Poll. 8. 109—111; 3. 52; Harpocr. *γεννήται*; Phot. and Etym. M. *τριτύς*; Mæris, *γεννήται*; Suidas, *φράτορες*, *φρατρία*, *γεννήται*; Schol. Plat. Rep. 409. Tauchn.

⁴ Niebuhr, R. H. 1. 226; Boeckh's observations prefixed to the Berl. Lectionscat. 1812; comp. Pub. Econ. 2. 28; Schömann comit. 341, sqq.; Creuzer, Symb. 3. 53; Buttmann, über Phratría, etc.; in Abh. d. Berl. A. d. W. 1818. 1819, p. 21, sqq.; Müller, Orchom. 307. n. 4. (However, compare his Proleg. 249, where the existence of priestly castes is contested.) See the contrary opinion in Eggo (Stuhr) *Untergang d. Naturstaaten*, 143, sqq.; Schubarth *Ideen, üb. Homer*, 62, sqq.; Tittmann, *Gr. Staatsv.* 567, sqq. 617, sqq.; Weisse *de rer. publicar. form.* 90. n.

scription whatever could have been established before a unity of state existed, and certainly not as long as several sorts of inhabitants, distinguished by various modes of life, continued to dwell together in Attica in local communion, and as neighbours only, but without being associated by any political bond. But that the inhabitants of Attica were not originally united as citizens of one state, may, not to mention the authentic account, that before the time of Theseus there was no common Prytaneum⁵, be gathered from the many traditions whose purport is obviously opposed to such an assumption. The laborious explorers of Attic legends have, with some difficulty, managed to draw up a series of kings; when the genealogical thread fails, the line is continued by means of an Autochthon, like Cranaus, or the son of a god like Erechtheus, and as this proves the want of continuity in the kingly line, so the mention of internal wars and partitions⁶ is an evidence of the absence of political unity. But the tradition was embellished in two ways, first, by ascribing a number of separate institutions existing in various parts of Attica, to the citadel of Athens, as though that had been a common centre in the earliest ages, as it was afterwards, and secondly, by extending to the country generally, those *mythi* which related solely to this citadel, and to the limited territory originally belonging to it. The absence of a political bond of union amongst the oldest inhabitants of Attica, is one of the strongest evidences of the unfounded character of those

⁵ Thuc. 2. 15; Str. 9. 397; Diod. 4. 61; Plut. Sol. 28.

⁶ Apollod. 3. 14. 15; conf. Meurs. regn. Athenar.

traditions which recount the institution of the four Phylæ by Cecrops, the change in their appellations effected by Cranaus and Ericthonius⁷, and the political regulations of Ion⁸. If an Ionic settlement really took place before that which is generally connected with the name of Ægeus or Theseus, it effected no change in the general condition of the country, and perhaps was limited to what was called the Tetrapolis⁹; therefore there can be no grounds for attributing the institution of the four Phylæ, as a regulation of classes for the whole of Attica as one state to Ion, or for deducing their denominations from the names of his sons¹⁰. Neither was this a general tradition, for the names of Teleon and Hoples occur singly, and without any reference to Ion¹¹, and the appellations of the Phylæ were derived from a mere allusion to their mode of life¹²; moreover, the derivation of the names of the Phylæ from the sons of Ion does not, as Strabo represents¹³, appear originally to have rested upon a corresponding territorial division, or distribution of classes, but must probably be referred to the general inclination of the Greeks to create mythical personages. This is perceptible in the account of Herodotus¹⁴.

The political union of Attica and the institutions that resulted from it, must be considered benefits of the age and government to which the

⁷ Poll. 8. 109.

⁸ Str. 8. 383 : — ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ τὴν πολιτείαν Ἀθηναῖοι, κ. τ. λ.

⁹ Str. 8. 383. ¹⁰ See the passages referred to in n. 1.

¹¹ Apollod. 1. 9. 16 ; 3. 15. 6 ; Apollon. Rh. 1. 72. 73.

¹² Plut. Sol. 23 : καὶ τὰς φυλάς εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰωνος υἱῶν, κ. τ. λ.

¹³ Str. 8. 383.

¹⁴ Herod. 5. 66 ; 7. 94. 95 ; 8. 44.

name of Theseus is commonly attached. The accounts of Theseus as a legislator and statesman, are still more uncertain than those respecting Lycurgus; however, there can be no doubt that he is the representative of a new order of things, which united all the inhabitants of Attica by means of common and legal bands, and, as a mythical personage, justly merits the legislative celebrity he has acquired, which is even implied by his significant name¹⁵. It matters little whether he himself and alone—for there are no grounds to dispute the reality of his existence—or whether circumstances produced innovations. In his time Ionic institutions began to prevail; we may also gather from the tradition, that they did not grow up in Attica from a purely indigenous root, but were preceded by an influence which emanated from the Ionic states established in the Peloponnesus. Even Theseus' father Ægeus, whose name refers to the Achæan Ægæ, the sanctuary of Poseidon¹⁶, was not accounted the real son of Pandion¹⁷, the king who reigned before him; moreover, he went from Megara to the conquest of Athens¹⁸, which also bears a foreign appearance. But Theseus, according to the tradition, derived his origin from the Ionic Trœzen¹⁹, the city of Poseidon; he, like his reputed father Ægeus, was accounted Poseidon's son²⁰; his course led over the Isthmus, he opened

¹⁵ See the excellent note in Creuzer's Symb. 4. 119.

¹⁶ Od. 4. 506.

¹⁷ Apollod. 3. 15. 5; Plut. Thes. 13.

¹⁸ Ap. 3. 15. 6.

¹⁹ § 13. n. 43; and concerning Theseus as a Poseidonian hero, Müller, Proleg. 271. 272. 360.

²⁰ Diod. 4. 59; Plut. Thes. 6; Schol. Hom. Il. 3. 144; Schol. Eurip. Hippol. 887. Conf. Odyss. 11. 630. and on the spuriousness of this verse, Plut. Sol. 20.

a way over the Megarian mountains, founded the Isthmia²¹, an Ionian Panegyris, which, we are tempted to believe, was formed for the purpose of uniting the Attic and Peloponnesian Ionians; even in the mythical relation of his age to Minos vestiges of an Ionic aggregate-interest are discernible; that is to say, when Onchestus, allied to the Ionians by the worship of Poseidon, rendered assistance to Megara which was besieged by Minos²²: it is not very improbable that the rise of the Amphictyony of Calauria took place in that age. In Attica, Theseus raised the Prytaneum of Athens into a common political sanctuary, established the Sunoikia, or Metoikia²³, made the Panathenæa a general festival²⁴, to commemorate the association around one centre, and, what was a natural consequence, placed the various tribes of Attica upon a common footing with regard to the same, and imparted to them one uniform political impress. Whatever neighbourly relation might have originally subsisted amongst the various tribes or classes in Attica, the institution of the Phylæ can neither have founded nor confirmed a fourfold caste-like division into warriors, husbandmen, etc.; on the contrary, it is much easier to show that it placed the four Phylæ upon a level in their collective relation to the state. To prove this, it is only necessary to mention that they possessed in common the above-named subdivision, consequently that each of them comprised Eupatridæ, Geomori, Demiurgi, besides Phratriæ and Trittyes, but that

²¹ Plut. Thes. 25; Hygin. 273.²² Apollod. 3. 15. 8.²³ Thuc. 2. 15; Plut. Sol. 28.²⁴ See the testimonies in Meurs. Panath. cap 3.

not one contained the lower class of people properly so called. A full elucidation of the nature of this division, which involved the chief points of relation between citizenship and rank and duties in the state, is reserved for the following chapter.

However, it does not appear difficult to explain the difference which originally existed amongst the four classes of inhabitants in Attica indicated by the names of the Phylæ, and how it came to pass, that whilst they retained those names, which seem to turn upon a difference of political rank, they were ranged upon a level as co-ordinate Phylæ. The fundamental principle of the Attic Phylæ, as of all others, was that of tribes; however, it cannot be proved that the oldest inhabitants of Attica were subjugated entirely, and in every part of the country, by tribes which migrated thither at a later period; on the contrary, it is far more conformable to the general analogy of Grecian history to suppose that several tribes, original inhabitants as well as settlers, dwelt beside each other as neighbours in the country, and this is corroborated by the connection between the Phylæ and certain parts of Attica²⁵. In the mythical account, this was asserted as early as the kingly age, upon the occasion of pretended partitions of land²⁶. In Solon's time the character of the political parties depended upon their respective localities²⁷; there was an oligarchical party of the level country, the

²⁵ Comp. Schömann, *Comit.* 360, sqq.; Platner *Beitr. z. Kenntn. d. att. Rechts.* 45, sqq.; Buttmann, *ü. Phratr.* 27. Consult, in particular, Müller, *Attica in Ersch. Encyc.* 6. 217, sqq.

²⁶ See the *Fragm. from Sophocl.* *Ægeus ap. Str.* 9. 392. *Conf. Apollod.* 3. 15. 6.

²⁷ *Herod.* 1. 59; *Plut. Sol.* 13.

Pediæi; a democratic one of the mountains, the Hyperacrieis; and a more moderate one of the southern portion of Attica, Paralia, the Paralii. A connection between the Phylæ and certain districts, which partially coincides with this, is expressed in the ante-Ionic designations of the former, asserted to have proceeded from Cecrops and Cranaus, namely, Cecropis, Autochthon, Actæa, Paralia and Cranais, Atthis, Mesogæa, and Diacris²⁸. Nevertheless it cannot be assumed, that the local principle uniformly and exclusively determined the four classes of inhabitants, expressed by the names of the Phylæ. The Argadeis²⁹, the tillers of the plain, and the Ægicoreis, the goat-herds of the mountains³⁰, derived their names from their local position; but this was not the case with the Teleontes or Geleontes and the Hopletes: their appellations bear exclusive reference to personal qualities and occupations. Besides, even if we were to adopt the hypothesis of a division into mountain and plain, we want corresponding third and fourth portions. Now it is true that the Paralia was afterwards counted as a third part of Attica; but not one of the four Phylæ is exactly suited to it. Perhaps the following view of the subject may not be considered unsatisfactory. Argadeis and Ægicoreis are designations of those tribes which were indigenous in Attica as natives of the soil, and were engaged in husbandry and cattle-breeding; Hopletes, the warlike Ionic settlers. It

²⁸ Poll. 8. 109.

²⁹ From ἄργος, plain, which is analogous to the Argive Ἀργεῖαι in Steph. Byz Ἄργος. Comp. § 9. n. 24.

³⁰ Plut. Sol. 23.:—τοὺς ἐπὶ νομαῖς καὶ προβατεῖαις διατρίβοντας. Even at the present day herds of goats are very numerous in Attica. Müller, Attica ubi sup. 219.

is possible that the two forms of the fourth appellation, Geleontes and Teleontes³¹, had the same signification—the consecrated priests of Eleusis³², and the affinity of meaning may serve to explain the frequent confusion of the same letters in other instances³³. Though it cannot be denied that the last two appear as a sort of nobility compared with the first, that is no reason for assuming as certain, or even probable, a total absence of nobility in the Argadeis or Ægicoreis. That the occupation of the husbandman reflected no discredit is very evident from the rank of those priestly families which derived their names from agriculture, viz., the Butadæ³⁴, and the whole worship of Demeter. But that neither priests nor warriors subdued the rest of the inhabitants, and that no distinction of ranks could thence ensue, is apparent from what has been already stated as to the original separation amongst the native tribes. The Ionic *mythi* alone take Athens for their centre; Ægeus conquers Athens; this was the seat of the Hopletes; but they did not as yet, like the Eupatridæ, afterwards extend their authority over the whole country; even the history of Theseus only appertains to Athens in its earlier portion as the Ionian chief citadel; the Pallantides and other families

³¹ Both forms occur in the MS. Herod. Eurip. Poll. Steph. Byz. (see n. 1.); γεδόντας, in the Frankfort edition of Plut. Sol. 23, bears the appearance of an attempt at interpretation; the Cyzicen. Insc. Caylus recueil. 2. 60—62. 69, have Γελέοντ.; on the other hand, Apoll. 1. 9. 16, Τελέων is the father of Butes, 3. 15. 1, but Τελέοντι must probably be read instead of Πτελέοντι; in Apollon. Rh. 1. 72. 73, there is Τελέοντος. Conf. also Hygin. 14.

³² Γελέοντες, according to Wessel. ad Herod. 5. 66, *illustres, splendidi*. Conf. Creuzer, Symb. 3. 53. n. 4. 153. On Τελέοντες, see Append. xiv.

³³ Steph. B. has Τάβιοι instead of Γάβιοι; Antonin. Lib. 4. Τόργου, and Strab. 7. 325, Τόλγου instead of Γόργου.

³⁴ Concerning this noble house, composed of Teleontes, (according to Böckh, cultivators who paid rent,) see Müll. Minerv. Poliad. sacra p. 12.

had independent lordships in Attica³⁵. The union at length effected by Theseus, and the raising of Athens into the general citadel of the country, seem to have been accomplished without violence; at least there is not a vestige of a tradition to show that these measures were accompanied by the oppression of any portion of the population. Therefore the association of the four chief masses of the inhabitants into one whole, consisting of four Phylæ, as the chief constitutive portions of the united state, could have been nothing but a means to unite them as partakers of equal rights as classes; the Ionic Hopletes, the Eleusinian Teleontes, and the autochthonic Argadeis and Ægicoreis, stood upon an equal footing in their relation to the state, and each Phyle contained gradations within itself.

Lastly, it is evident that four Phylæ naturally proceeded from a corresponding number of chief ingredients in the population; and here it is unnecessary, with Suidas³⁶, to take the four seasons for a basis. But it is asserted that before Theseus there existed twelve small states³⁷; this number corresponds with that of the subsequent Phratrias³⁸. In these, too, it has been attempted to discover a political regulation; and in spite of the Ionic Tetrapolis, which is mentioned with them, to ascribe them to the ante-Ionic Cecrops: the same inclination to refer numbers and forms com-

³⁵ Plut. Thes. 13.

³⁶ Under *φρατρία*. Conf. Buttmann ubi sup. p. 25.

³⁷ See n. 5. The names are given, Str. 9. 397, from Philochor.: *Κεκροπία*, *Τετράπολις*, *Ἐπακρία*, *Δεκέλεια*, *Ἐλευσίς*, *Ἀφιδνα*, *Θόρικος*, *Βραυρών*, *Κύθηρος*, *Σφηττός*, *Κηφισία*, *Φαληρός*.

³⁸ This is likewise the opinion of Ignarra (de Phratriis, p. 19.) and Buttmann (ubi sup. 25.), but from another point of view.

paratively modern to the early times may be discerned here; but it is easy to perceive the introduction of the Ionic principle in the number twelve, which was peculiar to the political system of that people³⁹; in the earlier age the number of towns, which might have amounted to twelve or thereabouts, was merely accidental.

II. THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE PHYLÆ.

§ 44. The statements of the grammarians, that the Phylæ were divided into races (ἔθνη), Phratrias, and families, Trittyes and Naucrarias¹, we do not interpret as though these designations in reality applied to one and the same object, and the distinction between them were merely verbal; but we shall endeavour to prove that the citizens contained in every Phyle, by means of the threefold division in question, and considered with reference to the manner, intention, and period of the institution, occupied three distinct grades of political rank. The first, viz., into national tribes, or, according to a more appropriate denomination, into classes, was a natural result of that inequality of rank and station which existed in the earliest ages, but required to be legally regulated as soon as the individual unions of Attica, wherein a corresponding inequality of rank had arisen, formed themselves into one state, in which it became necessary to provide a security for their common rank and collective rights. The stamp of antiquity is strongly impressed on the associations for worship called Phratrias, and probably none of the separate com-

³⁹ See § 23. init.

¹ § 43. n. 3.

munities of Attica were without them : again, after the state became united they exhibit striking evidences of legislation in the determination of a fixed number and a uniform subdivision. But positive and systematic legislation regulated the Trittyes alone, an institution comparatively recent, which was connected with more advanced and complicated political relations, being designed to regulate the public revenue and the contributions of the citizens to the same.

The accounts of the grammarians, though partly taken from Aristotle's Polity of Athens, are written without proper attention to the subject, and at the same time incomplete and misplaced. In attempting to explain the nature of the three divisions in question, they constantly confound one with the other ; but still the real fact, namely, that they were essentially and not merely nominally different from each other, may be gathered from their pages ². The truth of what is here advanced cannot be fully and satisfactorily demonstrated without explaining the real nature of these three institutions.

The word *ἔθνος*, by which the Eupatridæ, Geomori, and Demiurgi, as orders of a Phyle, are designated ³, most commonly signifies *nation, race* ; but according to the etymology, as well as the most ancient use of the word, community of race was by no means its peculiar characteristic. In the language of Homer, who throws the most important light ⁴ on the names of ancient Attic insti-

² See Append. xv.

³ Poll. 8. 111 ; Etym. M. *Εὐπατρίδαι* ; Hesych. *δημιουργοί*.

⁴ Conf. Buttmann, über d. W. Phratia, p. 36.

tutions, the word, in accordance with its original etymology⁵, means a horde associated and bound together by a similarity of manners and pursuits, and most frequently soldiers⁶, whose bond could only be an external one, namely, that of the march and the camp. This signification was never wholly superseded by that of nation⁷. That this only, and not that of nation or race, is applicable to the Eupatridæ, Geomori, and Demiurgi, will be most satisfactorily illustrated by an examination of the nature of the Demiurgi, likewise upon the authority of Homer's language.

Homer never employs the word Demiurgi in the sense of a tribe, the distinguishing character of which is the internal union proceeding from a community of extraction; nor does he describe them as a race of slaves annexed to the district, or, as is even pretended, to the soil; but the most prominent notion which the name expresses, is that of working—occupation; they are work-people in the public service, mechanics and artists, heralds, soothsayers, singers, physicians, and architects⁸,

⁵ Etym. Gud. 161. 16. ἔθος—ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἔθνος· ἐκάστῳ γὰρ ἔθνει ἰδίον ἔθος ἔπεται.

⁶ ἔθνος ἐταίρων, Il. 3. 32; 7. 115; 11. 585. 595; ἔθνεα πεζῶν, 11. 724; λαῶν ἔθνος, 13. 495; conf. ἔθνεα πολλά, Il. 2. 91; Λυκίων μέγα ἔθνος, 17. 552; Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνος, etc., and ὀρνίθων ἔθνεα, Il. 2. 459; μυιάων ἔθνεα, 2. 469.

⁷ Xenoph. Symp. 3. 6.: τί ἔθνος ἡλιθιώτερον ἢ ῥαψωδῶν; Plato, Repub. 1. 351 C.:—ἡ ληστὰς, ἡ κλέπτας, ἡ ἄλλο τί ἔθνος ὅσα κοινῇ ἐπὶ τι ἔρχεται ἀδίκως. Conf. Critias, 110 C.; Demosth. c. Aristocr. 668.: εἴ τις ὑμᾶς ἔροιτο τί πονηρότατον νομίζετε τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει πάντων ἑθνῶν, οὔτε τοὺς γεωργοῦντας, οὔτε τοὺς ἐμποροῦς, οὔτε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἀργυρείων οὔτε τῶν τοιούτων οὐδὲν ἀνείποιτε, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπὶ μισθῷ λέγειν καὶ γράφειν εἰωθότας. The same signification may apparently be discerned c. Mid. 557. 28.: φυλῆν, βουλῆν, ἔθνος—γένος is employed in the same manner, e. g. Plat. Tim. 24 A.; Aristot. Pol. 5. 8 5. 6; 6. 2. 7. Hence Hesych. Ἀγροῖται—ἀγροῖκοι· γένος Ἀθήνησιν, οὗ ἀντιδιεστέλλοντο πρὸς τοὺς Εὐπατρίδας. Lastly, Cic. pro Sexto 44; in Pis. 23; de Natura Deor. 2. 29, etc., uses the word "natio" in the same sense.

⁸ Od. 19. 135; 17. 383, sqq.

etc., without the badges of the vile and the despicable; partly wandering, and summoned by the state⁹; amongst whom, according to ancient usage, dexterity and skill were supposed to be perpetuated in certain families, and transmitted as a patrimony to their descendants¹⁰. If, thus examined, the Attic Demiurgi cease to appear in the light of a caste-like lower order of the people, which character has been imparted to them and the Geomori by Diodorus, who wrote in an Egyptian spirit¹¹, or rather repeated the statements of Egyptian priests, who arrogantly pretended that the institutions of Attica were derived from those of Egypt, then it is very natural to conjecture that they did not form integral portions of the native population, but a class opposed to it, non-resident, and upon a level with the subsequent Metœci. This coincides with their being named Epigeomori, a species of after-comers¹², and their not being enumerated with the others¹³.

Accordingly there remain two orders of citizens properly so called, Eupatridæ and Geomori. But the signification of the word *ἔθνος*, derived from their manners and mode of life, as explained above, is only adapted to the Geomori, whereas the appellation Eupatridæ expresses mere nobility of family. But here it is necessary to revert to the preceding conjecture respecting the coalition of

⁹ Od. 17. 386.: οὔτοι γὰρ κλητοί γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.

¹⁰ See Append. x.

¹¹ Diodor. 1. 28; conf. Hüllmann, Anf. d. gr. Gesch. 238, sqq.

¹² Bekker Anecd. 257, and Etym. M. Εὐπατρίδαι—ἐπιγεώμοροι δὲ τὸ τεχνικὸν ἔθνος.

¹³ In Dionys. Halicarn. 2. 8, where Eupatridæ and Geomori only are mentioned. On the other hand, the Eupatridæ are erroneously omitted in the perplexed account of Mœris in ν. γεννηταί.—ἡ πόλις τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸ παλαιὸν διεκεκόσμητο διχῶς, εἰς τε τοὺς γεωργοὺς καὶ τοὺς δημιουργοὺς, κ. τ. λ.

the four chief masses of the population of Attica into one state. For the denominations Teleontes, etc., transferred from them to the Phylæ, express various modes of life and a diversity of pursuits. But this equally applies to the nobility of each of the four Phylæ, and was even partially borrowed from it. For amongst the Argadeis and Ægicoreis there was a rural nobility composed of the richest proprietors of land and herds; but the names Teleontes and Hopletes were peculiar to the nobles; the lower class of people annexed to them must be understood as tacitly included. Hence a common name for the nobility, pervading all the four Phylæ, could not be taken from their way of life and occupation, for those were not uniform; but the essential quality of the nobility, illustriousness of birth, which was common to all the four species, furnished an obvious and suitable denomination, and in this manner the name Eupatridæ might be co-ordinated with the two others, which referred to the course of life and trade or calling. Now whatever reference it may appear to bear to family or race, the foregoing shows that the Eupatridæ are not to be regarded as a tribe sprung from one root and progressively extended, but as an order united by equal rank of extraction, which then maintained itself in its collective capacity by means of the exclusive nature of its nobility. Lastly, what had been produced in the natural course of things in the separate communities of Attica, was confirmed by legal regulations, inasmuch as the nobility of the four Phylæ received a corresponding political impress, and—once more to revert to the difference between our

opinion and that which perceives castes in the Phylæ—the institution of the four Phylæ is not to be looked upon as a subordination of one order to the others, but, since the citizenship of the early ages was most adequately represented by the nobility, as a regulation which placed the fourfold nobility upon an equal footing with regard to legal rights. The order of the Geomori was regulated at the same time with that of the nobility. Neither were these a race or tribe, or the most ancient inhabitants of Attica, who had been subjugated by settlers, and in consequence of the original difference of extraction separated from them in the manner of castes; but in the individual communities of the native inhabitants, the rise of the nobility was necessarily followed by the decline of the commonalty, whilst amongst the Ionians, even at the time of the migration, an equestrian order might have been singled out from the inferior warriors. The commons began to appear in a joint character after the nobility were united; by that means they likewise constituted an order, and their common characteristic, which is expressed by the name Geomori, was, that they were charged with the cultivation of the estates of the nobility as masters and proprietors, whilst the separation effected between nobility and commoners by means of the family principle, gave rise to an opinion that one order was descended from a noble, and the other from a base stock.

It results, therefore, that the Eupatridæ were the collective nobility of Attica, who, after the union of the four circles, formed one order, possessed the citadel of Athens in conjunction with

the king, performed the functions of the high-priesthood, administered justice¹⁴, and in war fought as knights in the foremost ranks of the army. The Geomori, the husbandmen who occupied the estates of the nobility, were denominated, from the rent which they paid, Hectemorii¹⁵, and from the nature of their labour, which was performed for hire upon the property of others, Thetes or Pelatæ¹⁶.

We have still to enquire whether these orders, as well as the Demiurgi, had subdivisions or not. The perplexed statement of Pollux, that they had each thirty families, consequently the same subdivision as the Phratrias, is disproved by the testimonies of other grammarians¹⁷. The foregoing has shown that the Demiurgi were not included in the Phylæ, but probably distributed amongst them in the same manner as foreigners or the occupants of hired lodgings are over various quarters of cities at the present day; moreover, the number of their families as such, and the same remark applies to the Geomori, bore no reference to their character as an order, this being the exclusive attribute of the Eupatridæ. But amongst these last there could be no limitation in the number of families intended to comprise the whole

¹⁴ Plut. Thes. 25.: *γινώσκειν τὰ θεῖα καὶ παρέχειν ἄρχοντας καὶ νόμων διδασκάλους εἶναι καὶ ὁσίων καὶ ἱερῶν ἐξηγητάς*. Conf. Bekker. Anecd. 257. and Etym. M. *Εὐπατρίδαι· ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ αὐτὸ τὸ ἄστυ οἰκοῦντες καὶ μετέχοντες τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους, τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιοῦμενοι*.

¹⁵ Did they deliver a sixth, or retain that proportion for themselves? In support of the former opinion, see Plut. Sol. 13; Pollux 4. 168; Hesych. *ἐκτημορ.* and *ἐπιμορ.*; and Hemsterh. *ibid.*; Schol. Plut. Euthyphron. et Ruhnck. ap. Bekker comment. ad Plat. 2. 327; for the latter, Eustath. ad Hom. Odys. 19. 28. Conf. Schömann, Comit. 362. n. 68.

¹⁶ Dionys. Halicar. 2. 9; Pollux 3. 82. Conf. Ruhnck. ad Tim. 211. 213; Casaub. ad Ath. 10. 12. p. 738.

¹⁷ See Append. xv.

body of the nobility; nobility of race, as such, being the natural offspring of circumstances, had been continued by custom, and its recognition did not depend upon conformity to an arbitrary numerical standard. So far, therefore, the families of the Eupatridæ were not regulated by positive laws. But, if the number of the families in the Phratias was really the result of legislation, then, in the case of the Eupatridæ, the natural and political family coincided; but still the regulation of the Phratias did not react upon the character of the families as members of the same order. However, it is a totally different question whether the families of the Eupatridæ were regulated numerically in relation to a share in the administration, which is a subject that cannot be discussed till afterwards.

If, in the arrangement of the classes, that difference of origin which had arisen naturally and had been continued politically, kept the nobility and the lower order separate, on the other hand, the institution of the Phratias and families appears to have been destined to gather the general body of the citizens within one great political circle. In describing the increasing circles of relationship, Dicæarchus calls the Phratia the union of several single families, effected by means of intermarriages¹⁸. Those of ancient Athens were of a different nature; they were twelve in number, therefore, three in every Phylæ, each consisting of thirty families, and every family containing thirty mem-

¹⁸ See Append. vii.

bers¹⁹. It cannot be denied that their appellation, and that of the persons contained in them, *Gennetæ* and *Homogalactes*²⁰, express natural affinity; but that the members were not necessarily united by natural ties, is evident from the licence exhibited in determining their number; and express testimonies prove, that the most prominent feature of this institution was a communion of worship ordained by the state²¹, in reference to which the *Gennetæ*, as sacrificial confederates, were denominated *Orgeones*²². However, the natural ties of kindred were neither foreign to, nor severed by, this confraternity of worship: it not only happened that natural and religious affinity were generally united in a family²³, but the whole institution was based upon natural relationship, and directed to its maintenance, whilst the two principles were intended mutually to act upon each other. Thus united,

¹⁹ Pollux, 3. 52. φρατρίαι δ' ἦσαν δυοκαίδεκα καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῃ γένῃ τριάκοντα, ἕκαστον ἐκ τριάκοντα ἀνδρῶν; conf. Harpocr. Etym. M. and Suid. in v. γεννῆται. Amongst the moderns, Salmasius ad Jus Att. et Rom. 89—156; Van Dale Dissert. 728, sqq.; Corsini Fasti Att. Diss. 5; Ignarra de Phratriis; Platner Beitr. 72. 101, sqq.; Tittmann, 282, sqq.

²⁰ Poll. 3. 52; Harpocr. γεννῆται; Ἀγάλακτες had the same signification, Poll. ut sup.; Suidas, ἀγαλακτ.

²¹ Harpocr. γεννῆται—οὐχ οἱ συγγενεῖς μόντοι ἀπλῶς καὶ οἱ ἐξ αἵματος γεννῆται, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐς τὰ καλούμενα γένῃ καταμεμηθέντες; Poll. 8. 111.—καὶ οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ γένους γεννῆται καὶ ὁμογάλακτες, γένει μὲν οὐ προσήκοντες, ἐκ δὲ τῆς συνόδου οὕτω προσαγορευόμενοι; Etym. M. γεννῆται—οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ αἵματος, ἀλλὰ νόμων κοινωνίαν τινὰ ἔχοντες συγγενικῶν ὀργίων ἢ θεῶν, ἀφ' ὧν ὀργεῶνες ὠνομάσθησαν; compare the valuable passage in Bekker Anecd. 227; Hesych. γεννῆται, Schol. Plat. Criton, p. 7; Phileb. 41; Tim. 202. ap. Ruhnke.

²² See, besides the passages cited in the preceding note, Poll. 3. 52. and Schol. Demosth. adv. Eubul. p. 115. ed. R. But the word *Orgeones* was neither the peculiar nor the chief designation of the *Gennetæ*; it was likewise applied to any other freely-associated religious connection, and equivalent to *θιασώτης*, Bekker Anecd. 264. It is thus explained by Harpocr. Phot. Suid. ὀργεῶνες, Bekker Anecd. 191. 286, and this may be called its predominant signification.

²³ Hence it was the more natural that *συγγενεῖς* should be used for *γεννῆται*, e. g. Isæus de Apollod. Heredit. 160. 178; conf. Harpocr. γεννῆται; Xenoph. Hell. 1. 7. 8.

they were to penetrate political society with the feelings of affinity, friendship, and festal communion, and regenerate that principle upon which the state had been originally constructed, in the more enlarged political circle, where it could no longer possess genealogical efficacy.

Hence the most important occurrences of private life were extended beyond the sphere of individual families, and amidst political kinsmen acquired greater weight and sanction. The festive meetings originally held by single families, and bearing reference to domestic events, were raised into a public festival, which lasted three days, and was celebrated in the month Pyanepsion, called Apaturia²⁴. On the first day a banquet took place; on the second sacrifices were offered to Zeus Phratrios, and Athene; and on the third²⁵, the children born in the preceding year were presented and received with sacrifices²⁶. Amongst the Phratores and Gennetæ, sacrifices were performed²⁷ when a boy attained the age of puberty; and when a virgin quitted the house of her father and entered the family of her husband, she was received with a similar ceremony²⁸. Finally, the Phratores were bound to prosecute the murderer of one of their

²⁴ Xenoph. Hell. 1. 7. 8.—*ἐν οἷς οὔτε πατέρες* (see *φράτορες*) καὶ οἱ *ξυγγενεῖς ξύνεισι σφίσιν αὐτοῖς*. The analogy of *γάλακτες* from *ὀμογάλακτες* and *ἄλοχος* (see Suid. *Ἀπατούρια*) supports the derivation from *ἄμα* and *πατέρες*, conf. Müll. Proleg. 401. On the subject of the feast itself, see the perspicuous remarks of Creuzer, Symb. 3. 505, sqq.

²⁵ Concerning these three days, named *δέρπεια* or *δορπία*, *ἀνάρρυνσις* and *κοιρεῶτις*, see Suid. *Ἀπατούρια*; concerning Zeus Phratrius Demosth. c. Macart. 1054. 10. On the edifice appointed for the feast, *φράτριον*, Pollux 3. 52. Of a similar character were probably the *Delubra*, Liv. 31. 30.

²⁶ Poll. 3. 52. 53; Harpocr. *μείον, οἰνιστήρια*; Hesych. *οἰνιστήριμ*; conf. on *μειαγωγέω*, Aristoph. Ran. 798. and the Schol.

²⁷ *Κουρέϊον, κουρίον*, Poll. 8. 107; Isæus de Philoctem. Hered. 135.

²⁸ *Γαμήλια*, Demosth. in Eubul. 1312. 1320; Isæus de Pyrrh. Hered. 62. 65. 66, from which the statement in Poll. 8. 107, Bekker Anecd. 228, Etym. M. *γαμήλια*, must be emended.

members in the same manner as kinsmen by birth²⁹.

This truly exalted institution, which exhibits antiquity under its most imposing aspect, must be viewed in the light of an attempt to unite the nobility and commonalty by means of family festivals and divine worship, and thus to produce a general citizenship. It results from the foregoing that there were three hundred and sixty families; every family contained thirty Gennetæ, giving ten thousand eight hundred Gennetæ in all. This systematic regulation of numbers must be regarded as the first attempt to ascertain the total numerical amount of the fathers of families, and as having inspired Lycurgus, and even the political theorists, Plato and Aristotle, with the inclination to adopt round numbers for the population³⁰, in which the wish to take the divisions of the year for the standard of political institutions probably had some share. It may safely be assumed, that the actual number of citizens exceeded that of the Gennetæ: a statement is likewise extant, that the supernumeraries were denominated Atriacasti³¹. These were entitled to succeed to the rights relinquished or forfeited by members of families; and as the Gennetæ were very numerous, vacancies constantly occurred; however, none but fathers of families and independent householders were entitled to become Gennetæ; in other respects, the difference between Gennetæ and Atriacasti cannot have been

²⁹ Demosth. c. Macart. 1069. 2.

³⁰ Conf. Böckh. Pub. Econ. i. 36.

³¹ Hesych. ἀτριάκαστοι· οἱ μὴ μετέχοντες τριακάδος. Hesych. is referring to private law when he says—ἐξω τριακάδος· οἱ μὴ μεταλαμβάνοντες παῖδες ἢ ἀγχιστεῖς κλήρου, τελευτήσαντός τινος.

considerable; thus the Phratrias and families were an institution which regarded the citizens in their collective capacity, and as the growth of the age of Theseus, it is perhaps the most solid monument of that renown which he has obtained as the reputed author of the Athenian democracy. But it can by no means be asserted that the nobility were deprived of any of their positive privileges by this institution, which connected them with the lower people. An examination of the spirit of the age will immediately show that there are no grounds for such a supposition, although the real character of the distinction enjoyed by the nobility in the Phratrias and families cannot be ascertained. According to the testimony of Philochorus, however, the members of the first family amongst the thirty families of a Phyle³² were called Gennetæ, and at one time Homogalactes. This appears to imply that the Athenian Eupatridæ appropriated to themselves pre-eminently the appellation of Gennetæ, and the honour of family or race. Of a similar character were the exclusive pretensions of the Roman patricians to illustriousness of race³³. Assuming this to be correct, there must have been in each Phratría thirty, and in all three hundred and sixty noble Gennetæ, a number which again reminds us of the days of the solar year³⁴; but in this case, as in the attempt to fix the relation in which the Phratrias and families stood to the public administration, it is impossible to arrive at certainty.

³² Suid. γεννῆται—καὶ γεννῆται οἱ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ πρώτου γένους τῶν τριάκοντα γενῶν· οὗς καὶ πρότερόν φησι Φιλόχορος ὁμογάλακτας καλεῖσθαι.

³³ Liv. 10. 8. The plebeian Decius says—Semper ista audita sunt eadem, penes vos (patricios) auspicia esse, vos solos gentem habere.

³⁴ See the commentary on Harpocr. γεννῆται, Suid. φρατρία, γεννῆται, Hullmann Staatsr. d. A. 15, sqq.; Buttmann, über. d. W. Phratría, 25.

Lastly, the Trittyes were totally distinct from the Phratias both in origin and intention. According to Aristotle, every Phyle contained three Trittyes, and every Trittyes four Naucrarias³⁵. The names and number of the latter exhibit in a very marked manner the essential difference between the Trittyes and Phratias, and may serve to remove the erroneous assertion that families formed the subdivision of the Trittyes³⁶. Moreover, that the Trittyes were not organized till after the Phratias, appears probable from the very nature of the word itself, which, as it were, devoid of all reference to a substantial object, expresses a mere numerical relation, and is in itself comparatively modern. Another proof of this, as well as of the difference between the destination of the Trittyes and that of the Phratias, is the statement, that the Trittyes had been established to regulate the obligations of the citizens³⁷. From this it may be inferred that the political system had made considerable advancement towards maturity. It is evident that the institution existed before Solon's time, from the mention of the Prytanēs of the Naucrarias during the tumults of Cylon³⁸; therefore it must be considered as an order connected with the liturgies, and was probably formed when the new Archons were instituted³⁹. We are, however, destitute of exact information as to their nature; it

³⁵ Phot. *Ναυκραρία*· — ἐκ δὲ τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστης ἦσαν νενεμημένοι τριττύες μὲν τρεῖς, ναυκραρίαὶ δὲ δώδεκα καθ' ἐκάστην. *Comp. Poll.* 8, 108. *ναυκραρία* — τέσσαρες κατὰ τριττὴν ἐκάστην.

³⁶ See *Append.* xv.

³⁷ *Aristot.* ap. Phot. ubi sup. τὰς δ' εἰσφοράς τὰς κατὰ δήμους διεχειροτονοῦν οὗτοι (οἱ ναύκραροι) καὶ τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀναλώματα. *Conf. Hesych.* ναύκραροι — τὰς εἰσφοράς ἐξέλεγον.

³⁸ *Herod.* 5. 71.

³⁹ See § 45. ad fin.

is difficult to reconcile with the insignificance of the Attic naval power and cavalry before Solon, the statement that every Naucraria was obliged to provide two horsemen and one ship⁴⁰; it may have been instituted by Solon, and remodelled by Clisthenes⁴¹. It is unnecessary to derive the word Naucraria from the fitting out of vessels; the etymology from *ναίειν*, to dwell⁴², seems more probable. Assuming this to be correct, the object contemplated in the institution of the Trittyes and Naucrarias must have been the drawing up the registers for the liturgies, and this makes them analogous to the Phratrias and families, which were ordained with a view to ascertain the number of the citizens. The accidental ambiguity of the word furnished a pretext for representing as its original meaning a sense which was not attached to it till after the rise of subsequent institutions. The Trittyes constantly retained the character of an institution for regulating contributions to the state burthens⁴³; hence, they were applicable to the opulent class only, and not to the people at large.

III. THE POLITICAL AUTHORITIES.

§ 45. Whatever opinion may prevail as to the historical existence of Theseus, the tradition that democracy had been established by him¹, appears

⁴⁰ Poll. 8. 108. ⁴¹ Conf. Boeckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 274, 275.

⁴² See Hemsterh. ad Poll. 10. 20, where *ναύκληρος* occurs in the sense of householder. Conf. Hesych. *ναύκληρος* ὁ τῆς συνουκίας συνεστώς; and Pollux, 8. 108, where the vagueness of the derivation from *ναῦς* is indicated.

— *ναῦν μίαν, ἀφ' ἧς ἴσως ὠνόμασται (ἡ ναύκραρία).*

⁴³ Æsch. in Ctesiph. 425; Demosth. de Symmor. 184. 15; Plato de Repub. 5. 475. A.; conf. Schömann com. 361; Tittmann, 271.

¹ Eurip. Suppl. 353. 405, sqq. 440, sqq., Ps. Demosth. in Neær. 1370. 16; Plut. Thes. 32, etc. On the *στοὰ βασιλῆος*, Pausanias found the inscription *Θησεὺς, δημοκρατία, δῆμος*, 1. 3. 2.

at least to have reposed upon this basis of truth, that in an age represented as his, something in favour of the lower orders was effected; and this, as was before conjectured, may possibly have been the institution of the Phratrias and families, whilst the democratic spirit of his government is most accurately described in the words of Diodorus, "he reigned over the multitude legally" (not arbitrarily, and with a capricious disregard of justice)². Isocrates³ vainly endeavours to represent Theseus' departure from Athens as a voluntary abdication, to make way for democracy: but the tradition that he had been driven from Athens in an insurrection⁴, and that Menestheus⁵ or Lycus⁶ had been the leader of the party opposed to him, indicates that the new institutions had considerable obstacles to surmount before they could be consolidated, and we may plainly discern the continuance of party divisions in the inconsiderable authority of the recently united kingdom, whose founder was resisted as illegitimate by the Pallantides and other noble houses⁷. Menestheus, the successor of Theseus, is said to have been the person who effected his expulsion; the succeeding Theseidæ appear in the light of powerless rulers; the Neleidæ, who had been driven from Messenia by the Dorians, were unable to impart firmness to the throne; after the death of Codrus the power was usurped by the nobility⁸,

² Ἦρχε τοῦ πλήθους νομίμως, 4. 61.

³ Panath. 439.

⁴ Diod. 4. 62.

⁵ Plut. Thes. 32.

⁶ Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 627: Λύκος τις συκοφαντήσας ἐποίησεν ἐξοστρακισθῆναι τὸν ἥρωα. On the subject of ostracism, see also Euseb. Can. 800, and Syncell. ad eund. Θησεὺς ἐξωστρακίσθη αὐτὸς πρῶτος θεὸς τὸν νόμον.

⁷ Plut. Thes. 13; conf. Apollod. 3. 15. 5.

⁸ Pausanias employs a faulty mode of expression derived from the analogy

and the kingly office, which continued to subsist in name indeed⁹, became from that time a responsible magistracy¹⁰. Many writers, either misled by the character assumed by the subsequent *demus* in Athens, which pretended to trace its authority to the primitive ages, or, like the orators, propagating such a notion intentionally¹¹, denominate the old Athenian constitution after the death of Theseus or Codrus a democracy¹², which detracts from the fame of Solon no less than his did from that of Clisthenes; yet independently of the preceding statements concerning the relation between the common freemen and the Eupatridæ, we are not unsupported by credible authority in the assertion, that aristocracy prevailed till Solon's time¹³. The nature of the form of government by which it was succeeded, can be but imperfectly gathered from the confusion in which the subject is involved; and historical combination must endeavour to reunite the scattered fragments which

of the political phraseology of a later age, 4. 5. 4; ὁ δῆμος — ἀντὶ βασιλείας μετέστησεν ἀρχὴν ὑπεύθυνον.

⁹ In support of this we may adduce Paus. 7. 2. 1: δίδωσι Μέδοντι ἡ Πυθία βασιλείαν; conf. Perizon. ad Æl. V. H. 5. 13; Schol. Æsch. in Tim. 746. It is also more probable that at the separation of the archonship, the word βασιλεύς, as a prescriptive title, was transferred to the second Archon, than that it was created expressly for him. Therefore, Archon does not appear to have been originally a specific designation.

¹⁰ See n. 8.

¹¹ Thus in Ps. Plat. Menexenus 239. A. the *ἰσονομία* is deduced from the *ἰσογονία*.

¹² As Strab. 8. 397: ἱερασιλεύοντο μὲν οὖν Ἀθηναῖοι πρότερον· εἴτ' εἰς δημοκρατίαν μετέστησαν, κ. τ. λ.

¹³ Aristot. Pol. 2. 9. 2: Σόλωνα — ὀλιγαρχίαν τε γὰρ καταλῦσαι λίαν ἄκρατον οὖσαν καὶ δουλεύοντα τὸν δῆμον παῦσαι καὶ δημοκρατίαν κατὰ στήσαι τὴν πάτριον, where the last word must not, as in the speech of the Thebans, Thuc. 3. 62, be interpreted *ancient, original*; for Aristotle regards Solon as the author of a new system, not as the reviver of ancient ordinances. Conf. Dion. Hal. 2. 8: ἡ τῆς πόλεως ἀνέκειτο προστασία (viz. amongst the Eupatridæ)· ἀγροίκους δὲ τοὺς ἄλλους πολίτας, οἱ τῶν κοινῶν οὐδενὸς ἦσαν κύριοι· σὺν χρόνῳ δὲ καὶ οὗτοι προσελήφθησαν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχάς. Diod. 14. 3: — τὴν παλαιὰν κατάστασιν, καθ' ἣν παντελῶς ὀλίγοι τῶν ὅλων προεστῆκεσαν. Æl. V. H. 5. 13: ἀριστοκρατία δὲ ἐχρήσαντο μέχρι τῶν τετρακοσίων, (i. e. Solon's council of the four hundred).

still exist, in such a manner that the old political edifice may at least be recognized.

We must, in the first place, direct our attention to the frequent limitation of the archonship. The distinction between the archonship and the kingly office, as before observed¹⁴, consisted in the formal responsibility annexed to the former. The dignity was at first retained for life, and descended in the line of the Codridæ and that of their near relations, the Alcmaeonidæ¹⁵. Medon, the son of Codrus, was the first of the series¹⁶; Alcmaeon was the last Archon for life¹⁷; the duration of the office was from that time (Ol. 7. 1.) limited to ten years; and after Hippomenes, the fourth of the list, had caused his fallen daughter to die an ignominious death¹⁸, other Eupatridæ, besides the two families above mentioned, were admitted to a share of power¹⁹. However, Hippomenes was succeeded by three more decennial Archons only. From Ol. 24. 2., there were elected nine annual Archons, an Eponymus, (who was for a long period denominated, by way of pre-eminence, *the Archon*), a Basileus, a Polemarch, and six Thesmothetæ, but all taken from the Eupatridæ²⁰. It is manifest that the authority and importance of the archonship were gradually diminished, by limiting the duration of the office, and increasing the number of the persons who administered it: in its general features it re-

¹⁴ See n. 8. ¹⁵ § 30. n. 3.

¹⁶ See the whole list in Euseb. Conf. Meurs. Archont. Ath. in Gronov. Thes. t. 4. ¹⁷ Euseb. et Vellej. Pat. 1. 8.

¹⁸ Æschin. in Tim. 175. et Schol. 746; Heracl. Pont. 1; Diod. Fragm. v. 4. 34; Bipont. Nic. Damasc. p. 42. Orell.; Phot. παρ' ἵππον; Suid. παρ' ἵππον, and Ἰππομένης, Diogenian. 3. 1.

¹⁹ Thus may apparently be explained Ἰππομένης—τελευταῖος βασιλεὺς in Suid. παρ' ἵππον, and Diogenian. ubi sup.

²⁰ Euseb., and from him Syncell., 169. C.; ἄρχοντες ἐνιαύσιοι ἐυρέθησαν ἐξ εὐπατριδῶν.

sembled the Roman consulate; the Archons were the organs of the Eupatridæ, and in their relation to them their power was narrowly limited. More unrestricted was their authority over the lower class; and there was no appeal from their verdict in judicial matters²¹. That passage in their oath, wherein they promise “to observe the laws, be incorruptible, or give a golden statue as a fine²²,” is strictly antique.

No doubt can be entertained that a popular assembly existed, but it was limited by the degree of authority exercised by the nobility. According to the above, it would appear by no means improbable, that a council of the Eupatridæ was selected from the Phratrias and families, and that this again led to the formation of a particular body, appointed to assist the Archon in the duties of the administration, and limited in number. In the attempt to throw light upon the nature of this body, it must not be forgotten that the public administration of antiquity, according to the development of the state, was chiefly distinguished by a judicial character, and most of the officers derived their titles from legal functions. Many of the public offices of Athens, which had maintained their ground from the earliest ages till a very late period, retained the judicial character alone, whilst it may be clearly discerned that their sphere of action had at one time been more extended. Let us examine the courts of justice before Solon’s time. These, ac-

²¹ This was the case with the new Archons till Solon’s time, Bekker Anecd. 449. et Suid. ἀρχ.—κύριοί τε ἦσαν ὥστε τὰς δίκας αὐτοτελεῖς ποιεῖσθαι.

²² Poll. 8. 85.—συμφυλάξειν τοὺς νόμους καὶ μὴ δωροδοκῆσιν ἢ χρυσοῦν ἀνδριάντα ἀποτίσαι. However, in Suid. χρυσῇ εἰκόνι, the conclusion ἐν ᾧ σφραγίσθαι, ἐν Πυθοῖ, ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, and in Plat. Phæd. 235. E. Χρυσὴν εἰκόνα ἰσομέτρητον, must be regarded with suspicion.

cording to an unquestioned testimony, borrowed from one of Solon's tables of the law, were the courts of the Ephetæ, the Areopagus, and the Prytaneum²³. Here, neither the Prytaneum nor the Areopagus is counted amongst the courts of the Ephetæ; but the Prytaneum is, indeed, afterwards added as a fourth to those held at the Palladium, Delphinium, and Phreattys²⁴; but the whole number, inclusive of the Prytaneum²⁵, is stated to have been five, although they are not enumerated by name²⁶. The truth may apparently be gathered from the valuable account preserved in one of the grammarians, concerning a court at the harbour Zea, of which the others make no mention, and which he includes amongst those at the Palladium, Delphinium, and Phreattys, etc.²⁷ These four courts, then, we suppose to have been the places originally appointed for the meals of the Ephetæ; and the statement that there were eighty Ephetæ²⁸, twenty from every Phyle, applies to them. But the Phylobasileis²⁹ sat in the Prytaneum. Draco established an appeal from their decision to the Ephetæ³⁰. Solon suffered both the Prytaneum and

²³ Plut. Sol. 19. ὁ δὲ τρισκαίδεκατος ἄξων—ἔχει—ἀτίμων ὅσοι ἀτιμοὶ ἦσαν πρὶν ἢ Σόλωνα ἀρξαι ἐπιτίμους εἶναι, πλὴν ὅσοι ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, ἢ ὅσοι ἐκ τῶν Ἐφετῶν, ἢ ἐκ Πρυτανείου καταδικασθέντες—ἔφυγον, κ. τ. λ.

²⁴ See a collection of all the passages bearing upon this subject in Matthiæ de Judic. Athen. in Dess. Miscell. Phil. 149, sqq.

²⁵ Demosth. c. Arist. 645; Harpocr. ἐφέται.

²⁶ Poll. 8. 125.

²⁷ Bekker, Anecd. 311. On the harbour Ζεά, see Hesych. εἰς τῶν ἐν Πειραιεῖ λιμένων οὕτω καλούμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ κάρπου τῆς ζεᾶς; Phot. Ζεά—λίμνην Ἀθήνησι. On the competence of this tribunal, see Bekker ubi sup. ἐνταῦθα κρίνεται ὁ ἐπ' ἀκουσίῳ μὲν φόνῳ φεύγων, αἰτίαν δὲ ἔχων ἐπὶ ἔκουσίῳ φόνῳ. In the court at the Phreattys were tried such as ἐπ' ἀκουσίῳ φόνῳ φεύγοντες, ἐπ' ἄλλῳ δὲ τινι κρινόμενοι, οἳ ἐπὶ πλοίῳ ἐστῶτες ἀπολογοῦνται; the difference is inconsiderable, and it is easy to explain his silence as to the first court.

²⁸ Schol. Demosth. c. Aristocr. 98; Suid. ἐπὶ Παλλαδ.

²⁹ Poll. 8. 120; Plut. Sol. 19.

³⁰ Poll. 8. 125; conf. Meier und Schömb. Att. Proc. 15. 16.

courts of the Ephetæ to exist, but raised the Areopagus above them both³¹. Hence the five courts and fifty Ephetæ, five from each of the ten Phylæ, must be brought down to the time of Clisthenes. He abolished the old Phylæ; the Phylobasileis were continued³², but the Prytaneum in which they had sat became a fifth court, and fifty Ephetæ, besides the president, five from every Phyle, were now chosen³³.

But even the separation of the Prytaneum from the courts of the Ephetæ fails to exhibit its real character, and it is necessary to revert to the time when there was but one Archon. As the latter then possessed singly the power and functions which were subsequently divided, it was indispensable that he should also have a chief seat of government. This was not, however, the place occupied by the subsequent Eponymus; but the ancient sanctuary of the state and centre of public life, the Prytaneum. The public repasts which had been held there from the remotest antiquity³⁴, the duties of the Parasiti³⁵, who were in Athens, as well as in many other states, at one time important officers³⁶, to whom must, apparently, be added the Colagretæ³⁷, who collected the sacrificial victims, and finally, the purchaser of the oxen, Boones³⁸,

³¹ Plut. ubi sup.

³² Conf. Meier u. Schöm. ubi sup. 116.

³³ To this may be referred Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 277, which may be explained from Poll. 8. 124.

³⁴ Σίτησις ἐν Πρυτανείῳ. (It was afterwards removed, together with the residence of the Prytanes, to the Tholos, in the new Agora, see Paus. 1. 5. 1.) Compare on this point, and on what follows, Müll. Dor. 2. 137, from whose scheme of the ancient Attic constitution mine certainly differs in some essential points.

³⁵ Μοερίς, παρασίτους τοὺς τὰ δημόσια σιτουμένους ἐν τῇ πρυτανείῳ.

³⁶ Athen. 6. 234. E. 236. E. 238. A.

³⁷ Ruhnck. ad. Tim. 171; Böckh Pub. Econ. 1. 186, sqq.

³⁸ Demosth. in Mid. 570. 7; Böckh Pub. Econ. 1. 232.

who is known to us from a later age, all tend to prove that a political body was permanently assembled in the Prytaneum. This must have been the Archon and his noble council, perhaps entitled Prytanes, to whom may possibly be added the Exegetæ, the expounders of the prescriptive ordinances in religious matters³⁹. To explain the subsequent condition of the Prytaneum, which was wholly different, it is necessary to advert to the increase in the number of the Archons. This was not as though a board of eight councillors had been appointed to aid the Archon in the performance of his duties, but the reason why this change in the existing order was followed by such important results is, that the character and functions of the Archon were divided and parcelled out amongst various persons with separate titles, whilst the number of the seats of administration underwent a corresponding increase⁴⁰. The Prytaneum could no longer belong to a single Archon, for it was a joint possession. In this capacity it retained its full importance in relation to the state in general, but the once-united administrative power, of which it was the seat, now being distributed amongst new functionaries, it possessed but a very limited share of its original jurisdiction, of the extent of which some idea may be formed from the circumstance, that even afterwards the judgment fees continued to be called Prytaneia⁴¹; still it did not, as in the time of its total degradation, merely take cognizance of offences committed by unknown criminals and inanimate

³⁹ Timæus, 109, sqq.; Ruhnk. Bekk. Anecd. 252; Harpocr. ἐξηγηταί; conf. Meier, de Bon. Damnator. Præf. 7.

⁴⁰ Consult on the subject of these, Bekker Anecd. 449.

⁴¹ Böckh Pub. Econ. 1. 369, sqq.

objects⁴², but, as is evident from the law of Solon cited above⁴³, had jurisdiction over a more extensive range of offenders. Phylobasileis are recorded as judges in the Prytaneum⁴⁴, but after Clisthenes they were only presidents⁴⁵ of the Ephetaë, who also sat there: but this does not apply to the early age. The persons about the Archon appear to have been the presidents of the Phylæ and Phratrias; we may judge of the nature of their avocations from those of the archonship. When the duties of the latter were divided, their sphere of action was no longer so extensive as before; on account of their connection with the public worship, the presidents of the Phylæ were associated with the king-archon in the Basileum, in the charge of what bore reference to that object⁴⁶. It is possible that the name Phylobasileis first arose at this period, in lieu of Prytanes⁴⁷, which was probably more ancient. Now, it is reasonable to suppose that as the Phylobasileis formed the council of the Basileus in religious affairs, a council was also assigned to the Eponymus and the Polemarch singly, and the remaining Archons collectively. If we consider that the division of the authorities must have been followed by a corresponding division in the subjects of administration, the subsequent institution of the Trittyes and Naucrarias, which was above conjectured to have arisen with the division of the archonship, will probably be viewed in its true

⁴² Poll. 8. 120; Demosth. in Aristocr. 645; Paus. 1. 38. 11; Harpocr. Etym. M. ἐπὶ Πρυταν. etc.

⁴³ See n. 23; conf. Andocid. de Myst. 37.

⁴⁴ See n. 29.

⁴⁵ Προειστήκεσαν, Poll. 8. 120. However, they appear to have spoken for themselves also, Andoc. ubi sup.; conf. Meier u. Schöm. 20. n.

⁴⁶ Poll. 8. 111.

⁴⁷ Plut. Sol. 19. βασιλεῖς are mentioned in one place—πρυτάνεις in another.

light, viz., as created to provide a sphere of action for the Eponymus in his capacity of chief officer and guardian of the physical strength of the state. It moreover serves to explain the account of the political importance of the Prytanes of the Naucrarias in Cylon's time⁴⁸. They may, without hesitation, be looked upon as the Trittyarchs, who succeeded each other in monthly attendance on the Eponymus, and hence Thucydides⁴⁹ might, in narrating the affair of Cylon, name the Archons themselves instead of them.

Lastly, little can be said with certainty of the Areopagus, notwithstanding the considerable power it is asserted to have possessed in the mythical age. There is no doubt that the hill of slaughter⁵⁰, as it was called, was the seat of a criminal tribunal. All the legends and traditions of the age before Solon, relate to judgments against murderers⁵¹. But the subject of the judges themselves is involved in great obscurity, and it is doubtful whether they possessed any share of the administrative power in other departments. It is, perhaps, not assuming too great a license to reason back as to its former political rank, from the form imparted to it by Solon. Solon was, in all probability, only entitled its creator, because he raised its authority. Hence we may conjecture that there formerly sat in the Areopagus a council of the eldest of the nobi-

⁴⁸ Herod. 5. 71.

⁴⁹ Thucyd. 1. 126.

⁵⁰ Charax ap. Schol. Aristid. Panath. 107; Reisk. Manuser. of the royal library in Copenhagen explains πάγος as signifying every sort of elevated place, "Ἀρεῖος διὰ τὸν φόνον." Ἀρης ὁ φόνος, ἑναροι οἱ πεφονευμένοι. (I have not yet met with the copy of that Scholium published under the inspection of Frommel.)

⁵¹ Sch. Eurip. Orest. 1648. Concerning Ilalirrhothius, Orestes, Cephalus, Dædalus, conf. Demosth. c. Arist. 641; Apollod. 3. 14. 2; 3. 15. 1; Plut. Sol. 19. According to the Schol. Aristoph. Eq. 447, the murderers of Cylon's adherents were arraigned before the Areopagus.

lity⁵², which was either on a level with, or superior to, that composed of the presidents of the Phratrias and afterwards of the Trittyes, and that this constituted a political body without the pale of the current administration, which being endowed with regular functions only in the capacity of criminal judges, was distinguished by this peculiar attribute.

b. b. The Constitution of Solon.

I. PERSONAL RANK.

§ 46. The aristocracy of the Athenian Eupatridæ, brought to the verge of dissolution less by the aspiring efforts of the lower order than by intestine dissensions, could not be re-established by the ill-judged criminal laws of Draco. In the first place, these laws were in no wise adapted to produce a radical change in the constitution, or to apply a remedy to the defects under which it laboured; the impracticable severity of their provisions necessarily endangered legal order, and crime became emboldened by impunity. Twelve years after the legislation of Draco, Ol. 42. 1, Cylon attempted to make himself tyrant; the murder of his adherents by the Alcmaeonidæ¹, involved these, the principal family of the ruling order, in the guilt of blood; and from this time the lower class derived strength from the continuation of party feuds². Till then it had not only paid tribute to the Eupa-

⁵² It is impossible to attach any importance to the statements purporting to determine the number of the Areopagites; as, for instance, 31 in the Schol. Æschin. Eumen. 731; there can be no doubt that the 51 mentioned by Philochorus (Siebel. 14.) were in reality Ephetae. Compare on this point, and on the opinions of Hullmann, Meier u. Schöm. Att. Pr. Introduct. 10. 18.

¹ Thuëyd. 1. 126.

² Plut. Sol. 12.

tridæ in servile degradation, but through the rigour of the law of debt abject poverty had been combined with bodily slavery³. Now, however, the ancient props of the rulers began to give way, the demands of the age became too imperious to be controlled, and a fundamental reform was indispensable, unless they wished to behold their despotic power overwhelmed by anarchy and confusion.

Solon, Archon Ol. 46. 1, was chosen mediator. Equity and moderation are described by the ancients as the characteristics of his mind⁴; he determined to abolish the privileges of particular classes, and the arbitrary power of officers, and to render all the participators in civil and political freedom equal in the eye of the law, at the same time ensuring to every one the integrity of those rights to which his real merits entitled him; on the other hand, he was far from contemplating a total subversion of existing regulations; for that reason he left many institutions, e. g. Draco's laws on murder⁵, in full force, or most wisely suffered them to exist in form, whilst the old and decayed substance was carefully extracted and replaced by sound materials. Whatever was excellent in prescription was incorporated with the new laws and thereby stamped afresh; but prescription as such, with the exception of some unwritten religious ordinances of the Eumolpids⁶, was deprived

³ Plut. Sol. 12.

⁴ Μηδὲν ἄγαν, Diog. L. Sol. 6. Τὸ ἴσον πόλεμον οὐ ποιεῖ, Plut. Sol. 14. Ἰσότης στάσις οὐ ποιεῖ, Plut. de Amor. Frater. 7. 889. It is evident from what follows that this must not be interpreted absolute equality. Conf. n. 9. and 66, and see Solon's verses ap. Plut. Sol. 18.

⁵ See Andocid. de Myster. 39; Gell. 11. 18. says, that Draco's laws—tacito illiteratoque Atheniensium consensu oblitteratæ sunt. This is not applicable to all, nor to Solon's time.

⁶ Lysias adv. Andoc. 204. But the magistrates did not take the oath not

of force. The law was destined to be the sole centre, whence every member of the political community was to derive a fixed rule of conduct secured against the vicissitudes of arbitrary power, by the clear and explicit character of its precepts⁷.

The chief power was vested in the collective people; but in order that it might be exercised with advantage it was necessary that they should be endowed with common rights of citizenship. Solon effected this by raising the lower class from its degradation, and by subjecting to legal control those who had till now formed the governing order, as well as by rendering the liberty of both dependent upon the law. The essential properties of citizenship consisted in the share possessed by every citizen in the legislature, the election of magistrates⁸, as well as the scrutiny of their conduct, and the execution of the laws by the courts of justice. This change was brought about by two ordinances, which must not be regarded as mere remedies for the abuses of that period, but as the permanent basis of free and legal citizenship. The one was the *Seisachtheia*⁹; this was enacted by Solon to afford relief to oppressed debtors, by reducing their debts in amount, and by raising the value of money in the payment of interest and principal¹⁰; at the

to apply any unwritten law before the archonship of Euclid. Andoc. de Myst. 41. 42.

⁷ Demosth. in Lept. § 76. ed. Wolf. The statement in Plut. Sol. 18. that the laws had been intentionally so framed, in order to admit a great stretch of discretionary power in their administration, can at the most only be viewed in the light of an explanation borrowed from the practice of subsequent times.

⁸ Here we may apply what is said by Aristot. Pol. 2. 9. 4. — ἀναγκαιοτάτην δύναμιν — ἀρχὰς αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν. Conf. § 37. n. 17.

⁹ Plut. Sol. 15; Cicero de Repub. 2. 34; Hesych. Etym. M.; Suid. σείσαχθ.

¹⁰ The explanation that Solon cancelled all debts (χρεῶν ἀποκοπή, novæ

same time he abrogated the former rigorous law of debt by which the freeman might be reduced to servitude¹¹, and thus secured to him the unmolested possession of his legal rights. Moreover, it may be confidently asserted, that the Seisachtheia was accompanied by the conversion of those estates which had hitherto been held of the nobility, by the payment of a fixed rent, into independent freehold property; thus domiciliation, and the possession of freehold property, were the main-springs of Solon's citizenship. A second ordinance enjoined, that their full and entire rights should be restored to all citizens who had incurred Atimia, except to absolute criminals¹². This was not only destined to heal the wounds which had been caused by the previous dissensions, but as till that time the law of debt had been able to reduce citizens to Atimia, and the majority of the Atimoi pointed out by Solon were slaves for debt, that declaration stood in close connection with the Seisachtheia, and had the effect of a proclamation from the state of its intention to guarantee the validity of the new citizenship.

Hence, this sacred right could no longer be forfeited through the operation of private law¹³, but through the commission of such offences only as immediately regarded the public; on the other

tabulæ), is decidedly at variance with the passage in the oath of the Heliasts, οὐδὲ τῶν χρεῶν τῶν ἰδίων ἀποκοπᾶς, etc. Demosth. Timocr. 746; and the disappointment of the lower orders after the legislation, who, in all probability, put the construction of the modern Levellers upon Solon's ἴσον. See Plut. Sol. 14. But the enactment raising the nominal value of money, only operated in cases where payments were made, but did not extend to dormant capital.

¹¹ Plut. Sol. 15.

¹² Plut. Sol. 19.

¹³ In the instance, Demosth. c. Aristocr. 1250, οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσι τοῦ λυσαμένου ἐκ τῶν πολέμιων εἶναι τὸν λυθέντα ἐὰν μὴ ἀποδιδῷ τὰ λύτρα, humanity seems to have superseded the legal precedent.

side, indeed, upon the principle of full rights for full services, the non-performance of a public duty might be followed by Atimia, or by the restriction or privation of the full rights of citizenship, and it frequently happened, even without the formality of a judicial sentence, that the neglect of an obligation to the state involved heavier penalties than a crime itself.

The regulation by which none but those descended from civil parents were recognised as citizens still continued in force; it was still the duty and the privilege of the Phratrias and families to see that it was duly observed, and Solon probably ordained the written registers¹⁴ with a view to perfect this institution. Marriage with a foreign woman does not appear to have been strictly prohibited¹⁵, and her children, although designated spurious (*νόθοι*), were admitted to the citizenship in its most important features, a few rights¹⁶, for the most part bearing upon the family-unions, only excepted. The right of naturalization was granted by Solon to deserving aliens, when six thousand citizens declared themselves in favour of the measure¹⁷, but these new citizens were likewise deficient in a few of the privileges of citizenship appertaining for the most part to the private rights of persons; they were not eligible to the priesthood¹⁸, but their children were; they could not give evidence, did not possess unlimited au-

¹⁴ *Φρατρικὸν*, also *κοινὸν γραμματεῖον*, Demosth. c. Leocr. 1092. 29; c. Boeot. 995. 28; Harpocr. Suid. etc., *κοινὸν γραμματεῖον*.

¹⁵ Conf. Meier de Bon. Damnat. 73.

¹⁶ Poll. 3. 21. Their youthful exercises were performed in the Cynosarges in the time of Themistocles. Plut. Them. 1, and Amator. 9. 9; Demosth. c. Aristocr. 641. 18: Phot. *Κυνόσαργες*.

¹⁷ Ps. Demosth. in Neær. 1375. 15.

¹⁸ Ibid. 1376. 17; 1380. 28. Conf. Platner Beiträg. 129. 131.

thority over their wives¹⁹, and could not be appointed Archons²⁰. The statement that Solon received a great many foreigners as citizens, and every artizan that presented himself²¹, appears highly improbable, as Solon was the first legislator who systematically regulated the condition of the Metœci.

The Metœci, as already stated, probably took the place of the former Demiurgi; their position was one of sufferance, but the protection of the laws was guaranteed them. Still their relation towards the state was not of a direct character; they were compelled to have a citizen for their representative (*προστάτης*)²², but he was not allowed to exercise a discretionary power over them, as an individual. Various oppressive services, such as carrying the vessels and screens²³, were not yet imposed upon this class²⁴, or, at all events, they were not yet treated with the same haughtiness as they were afterwards²⁵; but there can be no doubt that that was one of Solon's laws, which enacted that they should be reduced to slavery if they omitted the performance of their chief duty towards the state, viz., the payment of the *Me-toikion*²⁶; for upon the same principle, the citizen in a higher sphere, who omitted to discharge his debts to the state, incurred *Atimia*; this was also the

¹⁹ Demosth. in Steph. test. 1133.

²⁰ Ps. Demosth. ubi sup. 1376.

²¹ Plut. Sol. 24:—*πανεστίους Ἀθήναζε μετοικιζομένους ἐπὶ τέχνῃ*.

²² Harpocr. *προστάτ*. Conf. Petit, Leg. Att. 248. ed. Wessel. Heffter Ath. Gerichtshof. 88. 89. Meier u. Schöm. Att. Proc. 561.

²³ *Σκαφηφορεῖν, ὕδριαφορεῖν, σκιαδηφορεῖν*, Poll. 3. 55. Harp. *σκαφηφ*. Bekker Anecd. 304; Æl. V. II. 6. 1.

²⁴ This is also the account in Petit, p. 95.

²⁵ Aristoph. Acharn. 507: *τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω*. Conf. Vatic. App. 3. 82.

²⁶ Meier de Bon. Damnat. 37, sqq.

punishment of those who contaminated the civil blood by secret marriages with female citizens²⁷. However, the distinction of such Metoeci as had deserved well of the state, by placing them, with regard to fiscal contributions²⁸, upon a level with the citizens, as Isoteles²⁹, was a proceeding naturally to be expected from the patron of trade and intercourse. The transition from this position to citizenship was, it may be supposed, easy and natural.

The servile order, exclusively consisting of purchased aliens and their descendants³⁰, did not, as a body, stand in direct relation with the state; individual slaves became the property of individual citizens, but a certain number were employed by the state as clerks, etc., and were abandoned to the arbitrary pleasure of their oppressive taskmasters; it was even lawful to put them to the rack, and they were debarred from all liberal instruction³¹. Still the illustrious Solon was not altogether regardless of the rights of humanity: he allowed the slaves to prefer a formal complaint against any one who treated them with wanton outrage (*ὑβρις*)³²; they might also apply for an order to be sold to another master³³; an immediate refuge from misuse was found in asylums; the Theseum, which was afterwards erected, belonged

²⁷ Ps. Demosth. in Neær. 1350. 20.

²⁸ Bekker Anecd. 267.

²⁹ Harp. Phot. Moeris, Ammon. *ισοτέλ.* Poll. 3. 56. Conf. Wolf. Præf. ad Dem. Lept. 70. Böckh Pub. Econ. 2. 77, sqq. Suidas must be emended from Harpocration. Bekker Anecd. 298, the order of succession is: *πρόξενος, ισοτέλης, μέτοικος*. Conf. Dem. Lept. 466. 6: *πολιτῶν, ισοτελῶν, ξένων* (i. e. *μετοίκων*).

³⁰ *Οικότριβες*, Hesych. Phot. Ammon. Bekker Anecd. 286.

³¹ Plut. Sol. 1; Æsch. in Tim. 147.

³² Æsch. in Tim. 42. 43.

³³ Poll. 7. 13; Plut. de Superstit. 6. 635.

to this class³⁴. Both the slaves of the state and those of private individuals were sometimes manumitted as a reward for signal services, such as denouncing state criminals³⁵, etc.; these received their liberty as a gift, others purchased it. Those who were manumitted³⁶ stood upon the footing of Metœci³⁷; the citizens who enfranchised them becoming their Prostatae³⁸.

With reference to a share in the supreme power, the citizenship must be first considered in its largest extent, as a common possession of which the lowest persons were not deprived, and which varied in degree according to age; and secondly, in connection with those rights which proceeded from a difference of valuation.

Every citizen had a right to speak in the popular assembly, and to judge upon oath in the courts³⁹; but the former of these rights might be exercised at an earlier age than the latter. Upon attaining the age of puberty, the sons of citizens entered public life under the name of Ephebi. The state gave them two years for the full development of their youthful strength and the practice of those exercises which might ensure its efficient dedication to the most important duty of a citizen, viz., the service of arms. Upon the expiration of the second⁴⁰, and, according to the most authentic

³⁴ Poll. 7. 13. from Aristoph. Etym. M. *Θησεῖον* from Philochor.

³⁵ *Μηνύτης*, see Taylor lection. Lys. 714.

³⁶ *Ἀπελεύθεροι, ἔξελεύθεροι*, Poll. 3. 83. The latter probably signified those who had been released from imprisonment for debt; Ammon. *ἀπελεύθ.*

³⁷ See Platner Appen. 127. On the *χωρίς οἰκοῦντες*, Böckh Pub. Econ. 1. 281.

³⁸ Platner ubi sup.; Meier de Bon. 35, sqq.
³⁹ Plut. Sol. 18: *συνεκκλησιάζειν καὶ δικάζειν*: imperfectly in Aristot. Pol. 2. 9. 4: *ἀρχὰς αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν*.

⁴⁰ This is signified by the *ἐπὶ διετὲς ἡβῆσαι*, Harpocr. *ἐπὶ δ. ἡ.* and Poll. 8. 105; Bekker Anecd. 255; Demosth. in Stephan. test. 1135. 1136. et passim. But to this must apparently be referred τὸν δεῦτερον ἐνιαυτόν, in a fragm. Aristot. ap. Harpocr. and Phot. *περίπολος*, and Schol. Æschin. 764.

accounts, in their eighteenth year⁴¹, they received the shield and spear⁴² in the popular assembly, complete armour being given to the sons of those who had fallen in battle⁴³, and in the temple of Agraulos took the oath of young citizens⁴⁴, the chief obligations of which concerned the defence of their country⁴⁵, and then for the space of one or two years performed military service in the Attic border fortresses under the name of Peripoli⁴⁶. The ceremony of arming them was followed by enrolment in the book which contained the names of those who had attained majority⁴⁷; this empowered the young citizen to manage his own fortune⁴⁸, preside over a household, enter the

⁴¹ See in opposition to Harpocr. and Poll. ubi sup., who mention the twentieth year, Schöm. comit. 76, sqq.; Büekh ind. lectt. Berol. 1819—20; Platner Beiträge, 72, sqq.

⁴² See the last three passages cited in n. 40.

⁴³ Æschin. in Ctesiph. 542.

⁴⁴ Demosth. de fals. Legat. 438. 17: τὸν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀγραύλου τῶν ἐφηβων ὕρκον. See the oath itself, Poll. 8. 106. Conf. Stobæus 41. p. 141, and Lycurg. c. Leocrat. 189.

⁴⁵ This is contained in the summary statements, Lyc. ubi sup.: μήτε ἱερὰ ὅπλα κατασχύνειν, μήτε τὴν τάξιν λείπειν, ἀμύνειν δὲ τῇ πατρίδι, καὶ ἀμείνω παραδῶσειν, Philostr. vit. Apollon. 4. 21: ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθανεῖσθαι καὶ ὅπλα στήσεσθαι, Ulp. ad Demosth. ubi sup.: μετὰ πανοπλιῶν ὦννον ὑπερμαχεῖν ἄχρι θανάτου τῆς θρεψαμένης. Of the two readings in the formula of oath even according to the words καὶ τὴν πατρίδα οὐκ ἐλάττω παραδῶσω, Poll. (the text of Kühn) πλεύσω δὲ καὶ καταρόσω, ὀπόσῃν ἂν παραδέξωμαι, and Stob. ubi sup. πλείω δὲ καὶ ἀρείω, ὕσῃν ἂν παραδέξωμαι. The latter is unquestionably to be preferred, and with it coincide the concluding words in Lycurg. καὶ ἀμείνω παραδ. It was proposed that the land should be ameliorated by the labour of the tiller; this is referred to in the paraphrase of this passage in Plut. Alcib. 15. ad fin.

⁴⁶ See the last three passages cited in n. 40; Poll. 8. 106; Schol. Plat. Alc. 1. 69; Ruhnk. One is almost tempted to regard the expression of Pollux, περίπολοι ἐφηβοί, as a twofold appellation; it is at least certain that the name ἐφηβοί was likewise applied to the young citizens during the earlier part of their service. Hence, in Lycurg. ἐφηβοί γίνωνται, of those who took the oath of Ephebi. The service of the Peripoli was likewise denominated στρατεία ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι, (which may be explained with Vales. ad Harpocr. 128, from Plat. de Legg. 6. 760, μόρια τῆς χώρας), Æschin. de fals. Legat. 330; Harpocr. στρατεία; Phot. στρατιά, etc.

⁴⁷ Ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον, Lycurg. ubi sup.; Bekker Anecd. 272; Harp. Phot.; Æsch. in Tim. 49; Taylor and others from λῆξις, patrimony. Conf. Tittmann 279. n. 4.

⁴⁸ Æsch. c. Tim. 122.

popular assembly, and speak ⁴⁹. When he asserted the last right, viz., the Isegoria, Parrhesia ⁵⁰, he was denominated Rhetor ⁵¹, and this appellation denoted the difference between him and the silent member of the assembly, the Idiotēs ⁵²; but the speakers were not singled out from the rest of the members in the manner of a corporation or particular order, or in the character of regular functionaries ⁵³. What was called the Dokimasia of the Rhetors ⁵⁴, was not a scrutiny of office, but a measure which was adopted in case a citizen who had forfeited the right of speaking in consequence of Atimia, presumed to exercise it ⁵⁵, and it required to be preceded by a special motion to that effect ⁵⁶. That this Dokimasia is, in the ancient authors, so frequently classed with that of the Archons and Strategi ⁵⁷, must be explained from the growing political importance of oratory, which imparted a sort of official character, like that of the legally-elected military commanders and civil functionaries to the self-constituted demagogues of the day ⁵⁸. Moreover, after oratory began to be

⁴⁹ Λέγειν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, Æsch. in Tim. 54; δημηγορεῖν, *ibid.* Conf. Valckenaer diatrib. in Eurip. rel. 254 A—C. It was usual to class together λέγειν καὶ γράφειν (viz., ψήφισμα), as Demosth. de Coron. 286. 4; 288. 8; in Androt. 602. 23; Theop. ap. Ath. 12. 532, C.

⁵⁰ Παρρησία, Bekker Anecd. 198.

⁵¹ Phot. and Suid. Πῶς τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ δῆμος συμβουλευῶν καὶ ὁ ἐν δήμῳ ἀγορεύων εἴτε ἱκανὸς εἴη λέγειν εἴτε καὶ ἀδύνατος.

⁵² Æschin. in Tim. 33; Dem. in Androt. 624. 28; in Aristog. 782. 26; Isocr. Paneg. cap. 2, etc. Conf. Schöm. Comit. 110. n. 18.

⁵³ Schöm. 112, sqq.

⁵⁴ Æsch. in Tim. 26. 54. 55. Harpocr. δοκιμασθεῖς; Suid. δοκιμασία; Bekker Anecd. 241; Schöm. *ubi sup.*

⁵⁵ Æsch. in Tim. 55. 56; Poll. 8. 45.

⁵⁶ Δοκιμασίαν ἐπαγγεῖλαι, Bekker Anecd. 241, and ἐπαγγεῖλαι, 256; Harpocr. δοκιμασθεῖς—ἐξητάζετο γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁ βίος ἐνίοτε.

⁵⁷ Bekk. An. 235. Harpocr. δοκιμασθεῖς, from Lyeurg.

⁵⁸ Hence we may also explain Dinarchus c. Dem. 51: "Rhetors and Strategi must παιδοποιεῖσθαι," etc. This was not a law framed exclusively for the former, but was applicable to all the citizens in common; amongst whom, however, Dinarchus singles out Demosthenes as an orator, conse-

studied systematically, the word Rhetor became confined to the class of professed sophists⁵⁹, Autoschediasts becoming comparatively rare, and a marked line being drawn between them and the remaining mass. Finally, the order of speaking depended upon age; those who were more than fifty years old being entitled to speak first⁶⁰.

Upon attaining his thirtieth year⁶¹, the citizen might assert his superior rights; he was qualified for a member of the sworn tribunal entitled the Heliæa. For this purpose it was requisite to take a new oath⁶² in the open place called Ardettus⁶³, which chiefly related to civil duties generally; but its conclusion prescribed judicial obligations⁶⁴. This must be distinguished from the short oath which it was necessary to take before a court of any description could be held⁶⁵. The word Heliast does not merely signify a judge; but the citizen who has fully attained maturity, and whose superior right is proclaimed in the performance of juridical functions, as the most important public agency

quently a citizen from whom more especially civil services might be demanded. It is a mere rhetorical antithesis in Dinarch. c. Aristog. 86. Likewise in *πολιτεύεσθαι* and *στρατηγεῖν*, Isocrat. ad Phil. 154; the first must be emphatically referred to *δημηγορεῖν*; conf. Valcken. diatr. 254 C.

⁵⁹ As in Demosth. de Coron. 285. 8.

⁶⁰ Æsch. in Tim. 49. 51. 383. 386. Conf. Tittmann griech. Staatsv. 188.

⁶¹ Demosth. in Tim. 747. 9; Poll. 8. 122. The Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 330, confounding the ages of the Diætetæ and Heliasts, has *ἐξ ἐναντιῶν*.

⁶² Poll. 8. 122; the name was supposed to be derived from a hero who *ὑπὲρ ὁμονοίας ὥρκωσεν*, the people torn by dissensions, therefore without any immediate reference to a tribunal. Conf. Harp. Etym. M. Ἀρδηττ. According to Bekker A. 44, the oath was no longer taken than in the time of Theophrastus.

⁶³ See Ibid. how it was changed after Clisthenes. Demosth. in Tim. 746. 747.

⁶⁴ Beginning at the words *οὐδὲ δῶρα δεξομαι τῆς ἡλιάσεως*.

⁶⁵ Its chief contents were, to decide according to the laws, and in case these should be defective, to the best of their judgment; Dem. c. Boeot. 1006. 26.—*ὦν—ἂν μὴ ὥσι νόμοι, γνώμῃ τῇ δικαιοτάτῃ δικάσειν ὁμωμόκατε*. Poll. 8. 122, erroneously adduces this as the general oath of the Heliasts, and yet he there calls the Ardettus a court of justice, and mentions the Amphiochia!

of which he is capable, just as the rights of younger citizens are implied by the act of public speaking. The judges of the courts of the *Diätetæ* and *Ephetæ*, which existed without the circle of the ordinary tribunals, were required to be still older men than the *Heliasts*, viz., fifty or sixty years of age ⁶⁶.

Solon appointed gradations in the rights of citizenship, according to the conditions of a census in reference to offices of state, which, although not in themselves modifications of the highest legislative and judicial power, nevertheless exercised a most important influence upon it as advising and directing authorities. Upon the principle of a conditional equality of rights, which assigns to every one as much as he deserves ⁶⁷, and which is highly characteristic of Solon's policy in general ⁶⁸, he instituted four classes according to a valuation; these were the *Pentacosimedimni*, the *Hippeis*, the *Zeugitæ*, and the *Thetes* ⁶⁹. The valuation, however, only affected that portion of capital from which contributions to the state-burthens were required, consequently, according to Böckh, a taxable capital. This counteracts the unworthy notion that this regulation was intended to raise wealth itself in the scale of importance, and serves to exhibit its real object, which was to impose that burthen, which unpaid offices of state

⁶⁶ Poll. 8. 126; Schol. Dem. in Mid. 89; Bekker A. 235; Schol. Demosth. c. Arist. 98, etc.

⁶⁷ See on this species of *ισότης*, and that which was absolute and unqualified (the liberty and equality of the revolution), Plat. de Legg. 6. 757 B. C. Isocr. Areop. 222; Aristot. Eth. Nic. 2. 5. 9; 3. 7. 1; 5. 1. 2; 5. 7. 20, sqq.; 6. 1. 6; 6. 2. 4; 7. 1. 2.

⁶⁸ Conf. n. 4.

⁶⁹ Plut. Sol. 18; Poll. 7. 129; Schol. Demosth. de Symmor. 55; where the end is wholly useless. See the comprehensive exposition in Böckh Pub. Econ. 2. 29, sqq.

might prove to needy persons, on such as could administer them without prejudice to their domestic relations, so that a person who was declared eligible could only be dispensed from it by means of an oath⁷⁰, and thus to guard the state against the effect of that pernicious cupidity which is so frequently combined with indigence; it was at the same time a means to reward the citizen, who was obliged to satisfy the higher claims of the state, by the enjoyment of corresponding rights. The Thetes, the last of these classes, were not regularly summoned to perform military service, but only exercised the civic right as members of the assembly and the law-courts; the second and third, from which the infantry and cavalry were chosen, likewise acted as functionaries, and when irreproachable in other respects, and, according to the conditions of the census, sat in the council of the four hundred; whilst the highest class exclusively supplied the superior offices, such as the archonship⁷¹, and through this the council of the Areopagus.

This arrangement left the four Phylæ in full vigour, but attacked the very roots of those privileges by which the Eupatridæ had been distinguished from the rest of the citizens. The existing regulations were not abolished, it is true, for the Eupatridæ continued to hold the richest possessions, and consequently retained their position in the highest order; but how speedily must the fluctuations of wealth have been succeeded

⁷⁰ Ἐξωμοσία. Demosth. de fals. Legat. 328; in Timoth. 1204; Æschin. de fals. Legat. 271. Ὑπωμοσία only applied to a temporary impediment, Æschin. in Ctesiph. 462.

⁷¹ Plut. Arist. 1; Æl. V. H. 8. 10.

by the rise of other families! Sacerdotal privileges remained longest proof against revolutionary changes; hence, not to mention the priesthoods which were annexed to various noble families, the Phylobasileis long continued to be selected from the Eupatridæ ⁷².

II. THE POLITICAL AUTHORITIES.

§ 47. It has been said that Solon organized two councils, viz., of the four hundred, and the Areopagus, in order that two anchors might secure the state against the waves of seditious violence ¹. His real merit consisted in remodelling previously-existing political bodies, so as to render them adequate to the object for which they were designed. The line of procedure in public matters enjoins us first to speak of the council of the four hundred; the council of the Areopagus, which may be called the key-stone of the arch, must be considered last.

In lieu of the former council of administration, of which no memorial has been preserved ², Solon instituted a council of four hundred citizens taken from the first three classes, one hundred from every Phyle ³, of which no person under thirty years of age could be a member ⁴. The appointments were renewed annually; the candidates underwent an examination ⁵, and such as were deemed eligible drew lots ⁶. There is not a vestige from which it can be inferred that Solon originally appointed election of the members; those who in-

⁷² Poll. 8. 111.

¹ See Plut. Sol. 19.

² Conf. § 45. ad fin.

³ Plut. Sol. 19.

⁴ Xenoph. Memorabil. Socr. 1. 2. 35.

⁵ Demosth. in Mid. 551. 1; Lysias, c. Phil. Dok.

⁶ Βουλευταὶ ἀπὸ κλήρου. See the authorities in Tittmann, 240. n. 58.

curred dishonour might be expelled by the majority⁷. The internal organization, the change of the Prytanes, etc., cannot be ascertained in consequence of the alterations introduced by Clisthenes. It appears probable however, that as the twelve Trittyes corresponded with the twelve months of the year, each of the Phyle held the Prytany for three months, whilst the Naucrarias succeeded to the Proedria in each Prytany by rotation, and the Epistates changed daily. The principal political duties of this council were to receive propositions on state-matters from the Prytanes, who assembled daily for that purpose, to deliberate on the course to be pursued, and in case of need to prepare the affair for the popular assembly. It seldom acted independently of, or before the popular assembly, and never when the affair in question was of a legal nature⁸; it was only destined to act through the medium of that body to which it was to give the aid of its intelligence and advice. However, various departments of the public administration were confided to its management⁹; to these referred its decrees (*ψηφίσματα*), which were only valid for the current year¹⁰, besides which it could impose fines, at a later period, to the amount of five hundred drachmas¹¹. Nevertheless, it was still subordinate to the body of the citizens, to which appeals might be made¹². A

⁷ They first of all voted with beans, and afterwards with olive leaves (*ἐκφυλλοφορήσαι*); see Meier de Bon. Damn. 83. n. 278.

⁸ See the fragment of the oath of the Buleutæ in Dem. in Tim. 745. 13, and 746. 9. 10: *οὐδέ δῆσω Ἀθηναίων οὐδένα*. On the exception in the case of traitors and debtors to the state, *ibid.* 745. 14, and Andocid. de Myst. 45.

⁹ See Böckh Pub. Econ. 1. 165.

¹⁰ Demosth. in Aristocr. 651. 16. 17; Bekker Anecd. 289, where, singularly enough, *προβούλευμα* is used instead of *ψήφισμα*. On the longer duration of some, see Schömann *comit.* 157. n.

¹¹ Demosth. in Euerg. 1152. 10.

¹² *Ἐφεσις*, Poll. 8. 62.

general passing of accounts took place at the close of the official year¹³; a conscientious discharge of official duties was rewarded with a crown of honour¹⁴.

A popular assembly was an ingredient of the constitution of Solon, as of all the Grecian democracies; but popular tribunals, whose authority emanated from the assembly, but was superior to and operated as a check upon it, may be pronounced peculiar to his institutions.

The popular assembly was, probably, in connection with the Prytanies of the council of four hundred, held regularly on stated days of the month¹⁵; in cases of emergency an extraordinary meeting might be convened¹⁶. It was obligatory upon every citizen to attend it, and as early as Solon's time the loiterers in the streets were marked with a rope stained with red lead, and afterwards fined¹⁷; this was done for the purpose of inspiring the citizen with an interest in public affairs. It was expedient too that the share he took should be an active one; he was not limited to a simple aye or no, but possessed the right of making substantive motions, and debating on a measure. On the other hand, the influence of the assembly was so far limited, that except in a few urgent matters, such as in the case of an Eisan-

¹³ Æschin. in Ctes. 412.

¹⁴ Argum. Dem. in Androt. 590; conf. 595. 24; but it is probable that rewards for the construction of triremes were not customary till after Solon's time.

¹⁵ It cannot be ascertained how many days Solon set apart for regular meetings; perhaps one only, and this may have originally been the *κυρία ἐκκλησία*. Conf. § 48. on Clisthenes and Schöm. com. 31.

¹⁶ *Σύγκλητοι*, and when the citizens were summoned from the country *κατακλησίσαι*, Schöm. 28. 29.

¹⁷ *Σχοῖνος μεμλιτωμένος*, Poll. 8. 104; Sch. Aristoph. Acharn. 22.

gelia, etc., which were obliged to be first brought forward in the assembly, though even then not without previous notice to the Prytanies, every subject was first examined by the four hundred and then submitted to the people in the form of a Probuleuma¹⁸. If this was not immediately adopted by Procheirotomia¹⁹, it was modified by debate, and a different motion might be made by an orator, after which the Proedri proceeded to collect the votes²⁰. The question was decided by a show of hands²¹; the order of precedence amongst the classes, as beheld in the "comitia centuriata" of Rome, was not observed here. Decrees as to measures which concerned private individuals, such as naturalization, etc. required to be carried by six thousand votes²², which were given secretly by pebbles²³, etc. The order observed in the general conduct of business was determined by the Nomophylaces²⁴, with whom were associated the Proedri²⁵. The following subjects were almost invariably brought forward in the popular assembly: legislation, the election and scrutiny of the conduct of magistrates, certain public law proceed-

¹⁸ Plut. Sol. 19; Aristoph. Thesm. 372; Dem. in Lept. 541; de Coron. 296. in Aristocr. 651; Arg. Dem. in Androt. 587. 591; conf. Schöm. com. 96, sqq.

¹⁹ Dem. in Timocr. 703. 17; Harpocr. Phot. *προχειρ*.

²⁰ This is essential to the nature of public proceedings, in which debating takes place. Comp. Schöm. com. 98; Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 184.

²¹ *Χειροτονία*.

²² Andoc. de Myst. 42, from which a second *ἐὰν μὴ* must be inserted in Demosth. in Timocr. 719. 5. However, we cannot help enquiring whether by the 6000 we are not to understand the whole number of the Heliasts. With reference to a court in the case of a *γράφη παρανόμων*, e. g. Andoc. de Myst. 9, has *ἐν ἑξακισχίλοις Ἀθηναίων*. Conf. § 48. n. 42.

²³ Dem. in Tim. 719. 6.

²⁴ Bekker, Anecd. 283; Poll. 8. 94. Conf. Harp. Phot. *νομοφ*. Suid. *νομοφ*. and *οἱ νομοφ*. Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 338.

²⁵ See concerning those of Clisthenes, the only ones with which we are acquainted, § 48.

ings²⁶, peace and war, alliances, embassies, granting the citizenship, and financial proposals and accounts; under certain circumstances a decree of the popular assembly might be required on every subject connected with the administration²⁷. Thus, although no department of the public service was entirely exempt from its operation, still it by no means decided in the last resort on momentous questions, for that was the province of the superior tribunal, the *Heliæa*²⁸.

Six thousand, therefore, the majority of the adult citizens²⁹, were annually chosen from Ecclesiasts above thirty years of age in the capacity of Heliasts, without, on that account, ceasing to be members of the popular assembly. The *Heliæa*, the tribunal of those sworn judges who sat in various courts, did not act as an ordinary court of law, but as an official body entrusted with a larger portion of the supreme power³⁰, to which were confided not merely judicial questions, but general political matters, relating to the people at large, and from their nature strictly cognizable by the popular assembly, in order that they might be investigated and decided according to the proper legal forms. The intention of Solon to limit the power of the popular assembly by means of a superior board emanating from itself, and at no time at variance with its true spirit, composed of citizens

²⁶ Γραφή παρανόμων, εισαγγελία, etc. See Schöm. com. v. 2. cap. 2—5.

²⁷ See at large, Schöm. v. 2.

²⁸ On this word, see § 37. n. 14.

²⁹ Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 277; Vesp. 662. On the subject of the ingredients of this body, and on the constitution of the courts of justice, Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 293; Schömann de sortit. judic.; and against them Heffter, Ath. Gerichtsvf. 52, and Meier u. Schöm. Att. Proc. 127, sqq.

³⁰ Hence, Aristoph. Plut. 916: οὐκ οὐν δικαστὰς ἐξ ἐπιτήδεος ἡ πόλις ἄρχειν καθίστησιν.

of a maturer age, and bound by a stricter oath, and to cause that which, if discussed intemperately and decided upon prematurely, might prove detrimental to the interests of the state, to be weighed over by an assembly accustomed to proceed upon legal principles, is clearly exhibited in the regulation which made the introduction of new laws at the annual revision³¹ dependent upon the decision of the Heliastic Nomothetæ; wherefore no decree of the popular assembly could be superior to³², or even have the force of law, till that consent had imparted political sanction to it. Moreover, the election of the magistrates in the popular assembly was only a preliminary step, as those who were chosen had first to be examined by the council of four hundred, and a court of the Heliæa³³. There was no ordinance empowering the Heliasts to investigate all the other matters discussed in the popular assembly, it is true; but none were exempt from their scrutiny, and it only required an application to be made for any subject to be discussed according to the regular forms of the Heliæa³⁴, when the assembly immediately ranged itself under that superior court. This rendered the popular tribunals of such importance to

³¹ See the law, with additions from later times indeed, Demosth. in Timocr. 705—707; conf. Æsch. in Ctesiph. 429. 430; Andoc. de Myst. 40; Poll. 8. 101: new laws, *ἔδοκιμαζεν ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ τὰ δικαστήρια*. Harpocr. *θεσμοθέται*. Petit (186. 187.) erroneously considers the revision by the Thesmothetæ, alluded to by Æschines, a different proceeding; Wolf, Præf. Lept. CL., opposes this opinion with sufficient distinctness, and Tittmann in very decided terms, Gr. Staatsv. 146. n. 22; I am of opinion that the last takes the correct view of the subject.

³² Andoc. de Myst. 42; Dem. in Aristocr. 649; Wolf, Lept. 310. 311.

³³ Æsch. in Ctesiph. 399. sqq.; Poll. 8. 92; conf. Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 320; Heffler Ath. Gerichtsvf. 268; Meier u. Schöm. Att. Pr. 201, sqq.

³⁴ *Ἐφεσις ἀπὸ δῆμου ἐπὶ δικαστήριον*, Poll. 8. 62. Conf. Tittm. Griech. Staatsv. 144.

the constitution in general³⁵, and on this account the Heliasts were so frequently addressed as the popular assembly itself³⁶; and hence finally resulted the order of succession of the political authorities, Bule, Ecclesia, Heliæa³⁷, in the last of which only we behold the supreme power exempt from every species of Euthyne³⁸.

Lastly, we shall be enabled to form an adequate notion of the profound political wisdom of Solon, in making the supreme authorities of the state act as a check upon, and consequently strengthen each other, by observing that, as the Ecclesia possessed a preparatory board in the Bule, so the proceedings of the Heliæa were preceded and facilitated by the introductory labours of the *Ἡγεμονία δίκαστηρίων*, whereby the sphere of action of the magistrates, who were in other respects exceedingly limited, became enlarged, and another security was provided against delinquency; and this circumstance must therefore be particularly borne in mind in estimating the character of the magistrates. But it is first necessary to speak of Solon's measures with respect to these officers generally.

Those priesthoods and other offices which had hitherto been administered by particular families

³⁵ Andoc. de Myst. 5: *ψηφίζεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς ὅρκους συνέχει μόνον τὴν πόλιν*. Lyc. c. Leocr. 138: democracy is maintained by three things, *ἡ τῶν νόμων τάξις, ἡ τῶν δικαστῶν ψήφος, ἡ τοῦτοις τὰ δικάγματα παραδούσα κρίσις*. Nevertheless the unqualified assertion of the ancients, *τὰ δικάστηρια δημοτικὸν* (Arist. Pol. 2. 9. 2. 3), is only applicable to the institution of Solon in a general point of view, inasmuch as the people, and not magistrates judged; but it was very far from his design to establish absolute democracy by means of the Heliæa.

³⁶ See examples in Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 217.

³⁷ Demosth. in Aristocr. 653. 7. Hence in Lycurg. c. Leocr. 191, the mere Ecclesiast is, as an *ιδιώτης*, opposed to the magistrates and judges.

³⁸ Aristoph. Vesp. 587, Philocleon says: *καὶ ταῦτ' ἀνυπεύθυνον δρῶμεν τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὐδεμί' ἀρχή*. See the sound observations on the judicial power as a continuation of the legislative and as the practice of the laws, Platner Att. Process, p. 25.

or corporations, were by no means made solely dependent upon the state. Solon did not interfere with such institutions as were confined to the natural circles in which they had originated, so long as they did not operate prejudicially to the public interests, cautiously abstaining from disturbing the foundations of the political edifice whilst embellishing the superstructure.

One of his laws directed that persons should be appointed by election³⁹, and not by lot, to those offices which were conferred by the body of the people and for which a double scrutiny was required, viz. the Dokimasia before office, and the Euthyne during and after its administration; the former was intended to ensure the greatest possible excellence in the functionaries, the latter to give a pledge for their fidelity to the state. The Dokimasia conducted in the Bule, and in a Heliastic court of judicature⁴⁰, consisted in an Anacrisis as to whether the candidate was a citizen⁴¹, possessed a competent fortune⁴², was free from bodily defects⁴³, and fulfilled his duties towards the household and gentile gods, Zeus Herceius, and Apollo Patrous⁴⁴; moreover, whether he acted with filial piety towards his parents⁴⁵, had performed military service⁴⁶, and lastly, whether he paid his taxes.

³⁹ Isocrat. Areopag. 221; Arist. Pol. 2. 9. 2; Plut. Comp. Sol. et Popl. 2; Böckh, Pub. Econ. 2. 410.

⁴⁰ Poll. 8. 44; Heffter Athen. Gerichtsvf. 23, sqq. Comp. n. 33.

⁴¹ Ἐκ τριγωνίας, Poll. 8. 85.

⁴² Dinarch. c. Aristog. 86; Poll. 8. 86; conf. § 46. n. 70, and a hint in Isæus de Apollod. Hered. 182.

⁴³ Ἀφελής, Etym. M. ἀφελής; Lysias περὶ ἀδυνάτου; Polit. 170, sqq. 324.

⁴⁴ Demosth. c. Eubul. 1319. 22, sqq.; Poll. 8. 85; Phot. Ἐρκ.; Platner, Beitr. 88, sqq.

⁴⁵ Dinarch. c. Aristog. 86; Demosth. adv. Eubul. 1320. 18.

⁴⁶ Dinarch. ubi sup. That likewise furnishes us with a clew to the age, which most assuredly could not be under that of a Heliast.

The conduct of such as were of blemished character was legally investigated. The Euthyne during office, which regularly occurred at the commencement of a new Prytany, consisted of an enquiry in the popular assembly, whether the magistrates appeared to perform their duty or not⁴⁷; the Euthyne, after office⁴⁸, was conducted by a body constituted for that express object, consisting of the Euthyni and Logistæ⁴⁹, and the results of their investigation transferred to a court of Heliasts to be judicially decided⁵⁰. In the extraordinary case, that an Archon appeared in public intoxicated, it was lawful for any citizen who met him to kill him⁵¹.

The archonship, collectively considered, still continued to be the highest and most honourable amongst the offices of state; the Strategi did not become influential till afterwards, and only through circumstances, whilst the sacerdotal dignitaries and finance-officers never advanced beyond the limited sphere of their own peculiar duties. The prohibition to hold a public office more than once⁵², especially applied to the archonship. The essential change, however, which Solon effected in that dignity, was, that he wholly abolished the absolute power the Archons once possessed of pronouncing legal verdicts, and assigned to them the duty of examining and bringing the most important cases before the popular tribunals in which they pre-

⁴⁷-Lysias in Nicom. 842; Poll. 8. 95.

⁴⁸ Æschin. in Ctesiph. 405, sqq.

⁴⁹ Petit, 308; Böckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 203, sqq.; Tittmann, 323, sqq.; Heffter, 374, sqq.; Meier u. Schöm. 215, sqq.

⁵⁰ Phot. *εὐθυν.*; Poll. 8. 45, the Logistæ tried questions concerning money; the judges, *ἀδίκηματα*.

⁵¹ Diog. L. 1. 57.

⁵² Demosth. in Timocr. 747. 5.

sided by virtue of their office. The *Ἡγεμονία δίκαστηριῶν*, alluded to above⁵³, an institution admirably adapted, by its skilful manner of opening proceedings, to facilitate the final judgment of the *Heliæa*, was at the same time intended to strengthen that security which Solon provided against the premature resolutions of the people. With the exception of the right of pronouncing judgment, each of the three first Archons retained nearly the same range of duties as before. The Eponymus, as the representative of the state and father of the political family, conducted such actions as affected the rights of private individuals; the Basileus, as high priest, prosecutions which regarded the shedding of blood and offences against the state-religion; and the Polemarch, whose functions comprehended all matters relating to foreign states, lawsuits between citizens and strangers⁵⁴; each of them was assisted in these duties by two assessors (*πάρεδροι*)⁵⁵; however, they had more honour than real occupation. But amongst the most efficient instruments for rendering the new legal institutions of Solon of practical utility, were the six Thesmothetæ, whose name is occasionally employed to designate the whole body⁵⁶. They conducted the annual drawing of lots for the Heliasts, the judicial Dokimasia of the magistrates, appointed the days for legal sittings, and commenced those proceedings which were

⁵³ Harpoer. Phot. Suid. *ἡγεμονία δίκας*; Poll. 8. 89; Bekker Anecd. 262. 309. 310. To this may apparently be referred *ἐπιστάτης*, Bekker Anecd. 188; conf. Tittmann, gr. Staatsvf. 228, sqq.; 258, sqq.; Heffter Ath. Gerichtsvf. 15, sqq.; Meier u. Schöm. Att. Pr. 46, sqq.

⁵⁴ Poll. 8. 89—91. ⁵⁵ See Meier u. Schöm. 57, sqq.

⁵⁶ As in the Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 772? The ten Thesmothetæ mentioned there also belong to the constitution of Clisthenes. In Poll. 8. 85, *ἀνάκρισις θεσμοθετῶν* must be understood of *all* the Archons; conf. Demosth. in Eubul. 1319. 22, and, in general, Tittmann gr. Staatsvf. 261, sqq.

most important to Solon's constitution, such as the prosecution of the authors of illegal measures (*γραφὴ παρανόμων*)⁵⁷. The first Archon, from the time of Clisthenes, resided near the statues of the heroes, from whom the Phylæ derived their names; the Basileus at the Bucoleum in the regal Stoa; the Polemarch at the Lyceum; and the Thesmothetæ at the Thesmothesium⁵⁸. Joint agency was confined to a limited class of subjects; but the statement that Solon enacted that they should pronounce sentence collectively instead of individually⁵⁹, as before, is founded upon a misapprehension.

Solon conferred an eminent distinction upon the archonship, when he enacted that the council of the Areopagus should be composed of those Archons who had discharged the duties of their office with zeal and fidelity⁶⁰. It is erroneous to ascribe to him the first institution of that body⁶¹; but there is no doubt that to him it owed that political eminence which, in process of time, rendered its name so illustrious. In this respect it must be considered as an assembly of citizens, pre-eminent in fortune and station—whose character, both before and after the administration of the highest offices in the state, had been pronounced irreproachable. This council, composed of the brightest ornaments of the community, was destined for a focus of moral and political worth, whose ennobling influence was to be diffused through all the channels of public life. This, however, was not to be accomplished by the

⁵⁷ Ps. Demosth. in Neær. 1372. 7; Poll. 8. 86. 87.

⁵⁸ Bekker Anecd. 449; Suid. Ἀρχοντες.

⁵⁹ Diog. L. 1. 58; τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων ἐποίησεν εἰς τὸ συνεπιτεῖν.

⁶⁰ Plut. Sol. 19; Arg. Demosth. in Androt. 589.

⁶¹ Plut. ubi sup.; Cic. de Off. 1. 22.

personal interference of those chosen citizens in the turmoil of daily business; undisturbed by the ordinary duties of government, they were the venerable and parental guardians of the public system, who were only called upon to act themselves in cases of peculiar emergency⁶²—where danger was to be averted, or the effects of popular precipitancy to be remedied⁶³. By virtue of their mission to watch over the morals of the state, they were charged with the chief direction of whatever concerned public education; hence they nominated the Sophronistæ⁶⁴ for the superintendence of public decorum⁶⁵, honest industry and gain amongst the citizens⁶⁶, the maintenance of public worship⁶⁷, etc. A peculiar part of their jurisdiction was to conduct public prosecutions, although at the instance of the people, and in this capacity they took cognizance of false testimony, bribery⁶⁸, etc.; they moreover had the sole right to pronounce judgment on murder and offences against religion⁶⁹, a sphere of action in which their moral agency was eminently conspicuous, the state being supposed to have incurred pollution (*αγος*) through impiety towards the gods. It was only upon extraordinary occasions, as subsequently at the trial of the incendiary Antiphon⁷⁰, that by

⁶² For later examples of the rejection of a magistrate chosen by the people, consult Demosth. de Coron. 271. 272; Ps. Plut. Vit. Æsch. 9. 344; Plut. Phocion, 11.

⁶³ Argum. Dem. in Androt. 588. 20; conf. Arist. Poll. 5. 3. 5.—*ἐν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς ἔδοξε συντονωτέραν ποιῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν*, Plut. Them. 10; Suid. Ἀρειόπ. See examples from a later age, Lysias c. Eratosth. 428.

⁶⁴ Ps. Æsch. Axioch. 8.

⁶⁵ *Εὐκοσμία*, Isocrat. Areopag. 227.

⁶⁶ Ibid. 231; Athen. 4. 163. A. B.

⁶⁷ Harpocr. Etym. M. Suid. *ἐπιθέτους ἑορτὰς*.

⁶⁸ Dinarch. in Demosth. 5. 37. 43. 46; conf. Poll. 8. 88.

⁶⁹ Dem. in Aristocr. 627; Ps. Dem. in Neær. 1372; Plut. Pericl. 32; Diog. L. 2. 116; Meurs. Areopag. c. 9; Meier u. Schöm. 142. 305.

⁷⁰ Demosth. de Coron. 271.

virtue of their title to enquire into whatever might be beneficial or hurtful to the state, they set aside the decision of a court of law. In every respect they asserted a pre-eminence over the courts of the Ephetæ⁷¹ and the Prytaneum, which was at that time still separate from them. The assertion that they were responsible⁷², is only meant in reference to their judicial character, and this was not the case till afterwards; their moral agency was wholly exempt from control. Their authority was based upon the dignity of moral excellence, and was supreme in its sphere; no law defined where it became incumbent upon them to intervene, or how far that right extended; the strength of virtue ensured the ever-ready will, and wisdom determined the degree⁷³.

c. c. The Constitution of Clisthenes.

§ 48. In order to form a just notion of the variations which the constitution of Solon underwent a short time after its introduction, in consequence of the tyranny of the Pisistratidæ and subsequently through Clisthenes, it is first necessary to regard those measures which Solon adopted to consolidate his institutions, and at the same time to leave room for further development. How fully he estimated the influence of good morals and the importance of prescription, may be gathered from the preceding account of the Areopagus, and the appointment of functionaries allied to it in moral character, for the education of youth and the maintenance of decorum, as well as from the fact, that he retained many of

⁷¹ Plut. Sol. 19; Poll. 8. 125: ἐφετῶν δικαστήριον κατεγελάσθη.

⁷² Æschin. in Ctesiph. 468; conf. Meier u. Schöm. 216.

⁷³ Most characteristic are the words τὰ πολιτικά διῶκει σεμνῶς, Bekker Anecd. 444, and Suid. Ἀρεϊόπ.

the institutions of the earlier age. But it was not his intention that the main support of his work should be derived from blind habit; his political education did not begin with unconscious infancy, but with the ripening youth of the Ephebi; neither did he, in all probability, as one of his observations at first sight appears to imply, suppose that permanent respect for the laws could be maintained by rewards and punishments alone¹; this was intended to result from examination and conviction². To stimulate the patriotic sentiments of the citizens, and their interest in the stability of the laws, and to preclude attacks upon them, Solon gave every citizen a right to bring actions in cases affecting the interest of the state³. One of the main pillars of the constitution was the law empowering any citizen publicly to accuse the author of illegal measures (*γραφὴ παρανόμων*)⁴. That he had a presentiment of the pernicious consequences which might result from the abuse of this right, whenever the public mind should become contaminated, is evident from the ordinance which declares, that the accuser should pay a fine⁵ in case he failed to substantiate his charge. But he was chiefly actuated by a confidence in the existence of good feeling, and an exalted notion of the expediency of a general interest in the security of the laws⁶, and could not possibly foresee what rank

¹ See Cic. ad M. Brut. 15. As a general principle this is more accurately expressed in Plut. de lib. Educand. 6. 41; *δύο γὰρ ταῦτα ὥσπερ εἰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρετῆς εἰσιν, ἐλπίς τε τιμῆς καὶ φόβος τιμωρίας.*

² Solon's answer to Anacharsis, Plut. Sol. 5; *τοὺς νόμους αὐτὸς οὕτως ἀρμόζεται τοῖς πολίταις, ὥστε πᾶσι τοῦ παρανομεῖν βέλτιον ἐπιδειξάι το δίκαιοπραγεῖν.*

³ Plut. Sol. 18; Dem. in Mid. 528; Poll. 8. 40.

⁴ Dem. in Timocr. 748. 765. 766; Æsch. in Ctesiph. 388. 393.

⁵ Böckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 406, sqq.

⁶ See his words in Plut. Sept. Sap. Conviv. 6. 586; *δοκεῖ—πόλις ἀριστα πράττειν—ἐν ᾗ τὸν ἀδικήσαντα τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος οὐδὲν ἦττον οἱ μὴ ἀδικηθέντες προβάλλονται καὶ κολάζουσι.*

weeds would once spring from this hotbed of sycophancy. His design to imbue the actions of the citizens with the principles of equity, and to accustom them to the application of legal measures, is nearly allied with his policy in giving them the choice of several modes of procedure in conducting suits⁷. Hence of a corresponding character were the measures taken to ensure the preservation of the laws in general; such as committing them to writing, and the public exhibition of the legal tables⁸ at the Acropolis⁹, in order that the citizens might become familiarized with their precepts. To this must be added the use of writing in public proceedings, the establishment of archives¹⁰, and the nomination of clerks and keepers of the same¹¹. Solon, moreover, decreed that whenever legal order should be endangered by civil feuds, no citizen was to remain neuter¹²; thus making an interest in the affairs of the state a paramount duty under all circumstances, and erecting a defence against egotism, which is ever on the watch to reap its own advantage from the dissensions of others.

As his intention was to call forth and exercise the activity of the reason, and not to cement prescriptive usages, he not only permitted but enjoined that such changes should be made in the laws as should be adapted to the exigencies of the age¹³.

⁷ Dem. in Androt. 601.

⁸ **ἄξονες, κύρβεις*, Plut. Sol. 25; Harpoer. Ammon. Phot. Etym. M. Suid. under both words, Poll. 8. 128; Bekker Anecd. 274. 413; Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 1447; Av. 1360; Plat. Repub. 38; Apoll. Rh. 4. 280; conf. Ruhnk. ad Tim. 170; Meurs. Sol. C. 24.

⁹ Harpoer. *ὁ κάτωθεν νόμος*.

¹⁰ In the Metroon, Demosth. de Fals. Legat. 381. 2; in Aristog. 799. 25.

¹¹ **Ἀντιγραφεῖς, γραμματεῖς*, Böckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 200--203.

¹² Cic. ad Att. 10. 1; Plut. de Sera Num. Vindict. 8. 145.

¹³ See § 47. n. 56.

The Prytanes and Proedri, for the time being, were ordered annually to revise them, and were liable to punishment in case they omitted to do so¹⁴. It was the province of the Heliastic Nomothetæ to decide upon what proposals it was lawful for citizens to make upon this occasion¹⁵. This is perfectly reconcilable with the statement that Solon, in order to consolidate his ordinances at their first introduction, caused the citizens to take an oath to obey them for several years¹⁶, as well as with the encomiums passed by Demosthenes¹⁷ on the ancient constancy, as contrasted with the mania for psephisms which prevailed in his time. As a measure of security, it was enacted that a new law should have effect immediately after the abolition of that which it was intended to replace¹⁸, but not before.

But the results were very different from those which Solon contemplated; evil passions could not be subdued by ideas¹⁹; ambition and egotism kept up the ancient differences between the *Pediæi*, *Paralii*, and *Hypercracrii*. The lower order, far from being satisfied with the legal rights it had obtained, and disposed to yield ready obedience to the munificent dispenser of largesses and donations, took part in the contest, and thereby, three years after Solon's archonship, Ol. 54. 4, brought on the tyranny of Pisistratus, who, although several times expelled, at length permanently established his domination. The institutions of Solon continued to

¹⁴ Demosth. in Tim. 706. 25, sqq. ¹⁵ Ibid. 707. 7. 8.

¹⁶ § 40. n. 39.

¹⁷ In Lept. 484. 22 :—τότε μὲν—τοῖς μὲν ὑπάρχουσι νόμοις ἐχρῶντο, καινοῦς δ' οὐκ ἐτίθεισαν.

¹⁸ Ibid. in Timocr. 710. 19; 711. 5. Conf. in Lept. 486. 13. 14.

¹⁹ Heyne, Opusc. 4. 396: Atheniensium respublica—hoc ipso—vitio laboravit, quod a ratione et judicio hominum expectabantur plura, quam a cupiditatibus metuebantur. Conf. Müll. Dor. 2. 51.

exist indeed, but without that vitality which popular liberty could alone impart to them. Upon the expulsion of Hippias, forty-one years after the commencement of the tyranny, the ancient spirit of faction once more returned, and at length occasioned the legislation of Clisthenes the Alcmaeonid.

The fame of Solon has cast the work of his imitator Clisthenes into the shade. This was a natural consequence of the endeavours of the latter to incorporate his work with that of Solon, so that in later ages the subsequent accessions were frequently confounded with the original. That tendency in the Greeks, in equal violation of chronology and the nature of the subject they were considering, to accumulate upon one individual, as a convenient point of reference, the events of different ages, is eminently displayed in their use of Solon's name. It is not unfrequently employed by them, and especially by the orators, in treating of various laws and institutions of Clisthenes²⁰, and other legislators of the following age, till the archonship of Euclid; and we should regard every law to which the name of Solon is attached with the suspicion that it may contain subsequent interpolations²¹, or even be entirely the production of a later age. Most important consequences have resulted from thus confounding together the peculiarities of

²⁰ A remarkable example of the subordination of Clisthenes to Solon occurs Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 37: *δημάρχους οἱ περὶ Σόλωνα καθίσταντο*.

²¹ e. g. Andocid. de Myst. 49, the mention of Harmodius and Aristogiton; the "eleven" Demosth. in Timocr. 733. 12; the council of five hundred drawing lots for the archonship, and other things of a similar character in the oath of the Heliasts, such as *οὐδὲ τοὺς φύγοντας κατάξω*, which is not applicable to Solon, who reinstated the *ἀτίμους* in their rights. See Ibid. 746. and 747. Compare, on this point, Schömann, Comit. 266. 267; Meier de Bon. Damn. 2.

Solon and Clisthenes, and one of them is, that the political character of the former has been erroneously described as absolutely democratical; and in expressing opinions respecting the laws of the latter, the ancients seldom evince an accurate knowledge of their nature²². To form just notions on this subject, it is requisite to enquire into the motives which induced Clisthenes to effect political changes.

A pure love of democracy can scarcely be ascribed to him, as an off-shoot of the royal nobility²³; and, indeed, Herodotus²⁴ distinctly informs us, that in the civil contest, wherein Clisthenes and Isagoras were opposed to each other as chiefs, the former did not attempt to conciliate the friendship of the lower orders before he was almost subdued; his institutions must therefore be considered in connection with his efforts to overcome his adversary. Amongst their main provisions, it is recorded that he formed ten new Phylæ in lieu of the four ancient ones; these were Erechtheis, Ægeis, Pan-

²² Isocrat. Areopag. 220, ed. Lange, speaks of a democracy which Solon δημοτικώτατος ἐνομοθέτησε, but Clisthenes πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατέστησε, where both appear in a false light. Plut. Cim. 15, says, somewhat inaccurately, τὴν ἐπὶ Κλεισθένους ἀριστοκρατίαν; but it may be explained from Plut. Aris. 2, and an. Seni Respub. etc., 9. 159. 214, that Clisthenes was the prototype of Aristides, and should accordingly be judged from a correct estimate of the latter. It is truly observed, Plut. Pericl. 3:—νόμους ἔθετο καὶ πολιτείαν ἄριστα κεκραμένην πρὸς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ σωτηρίαν κατέστησε; Isocrat. de Big. 612: Alcibiades the elder, (who must be regarded as an anti-oligarch, because he seems to have given the Spartans notice of the cessation of the Proxenia, Thuc. 5. 43; 6. 89,) and Clisthenes, κατέστησαν ἐκείνην τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ἐξ ἧς οἱ πολῖται πρὸς μὲν ἀνδρίαν, κ. τ. λ. Lastly, the relation of Clisthenes to Solon is concisely and accurately expressed, Arist. Pol. 2. 6. 11: βουλόμενος αὐξῆσαι τὴν δημοκρατίαν.

²³ § 30. n. 3.

²⁴ Herod. 5. 66: ἐσσούμενος τὸν δῆμον προσεταιρίζεται; 5. 69, τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον, πρότερον ἀπωσμένον τότε πάντα πρὸς τὴν ἰωνοῦ μοῖρην προσεθήκατο; and afterwards, ἦν δὲ τὸν δῆμον προσθέμενος πολλῶ καθύπερθε τῶν ἀντιστασιατῶν. This enables us to form a judgment of the ἐλευθεροῦν, 5. 62. Herodotus by no means understood why the Phylæ were changed; he conjectures that it was done in order that the Athenians might not have the same sort of Phylæ as the Ionians.

dionis, Leontis, Acamantis, Æneis, Cecropis, Hippothoontis, Æantis, and Antiochis²⁵. This Aristotle describes as democratic²⁶; and the reason he afterwards assigns is, that the dissolution of ancient connections, and the greatest possible mixture of the citizens, are calculated to promote the introduction of democracy²⁷. Therefore it is not so much to the increase in the number of the Phylæ, as to the abolition of institutions which were connected with the ancient Phylæ, but which impeded the progress of democracy, that we should direct our attention as the most prominent feature in the changes of Clisthenes. Here the eye naturally reverts to the conduct of his opponent Isagoras. He, with his friends Cleomenes of Sparta²⁸ and Timasitheus of Delphi²⁹, resolutely struggling against the restoration of Solon's constitution, had aimed at the establishment of an aristocracy; the Phylæ, Phratrias, etc., forms of the ancient aristocracy into which the new one might easily be fitted, were still in existence. By destroying these, a powerful obstacle was opposed to any attempts at restoring the old anti-democratic system. Hence the new founder of popular power cast down these few remaining pillars of aristocratic authority; the four Phylobasileis, as connected with the divine worship, were continued indeed³⁰, but without

²⁵ See Corsini f. Att. diss. 3. n. 6; 4. n. 2, sqq.

²⁶ Aristot. Pol. 6. 4. 11, probably alluding to Clisthenes, names, as a means to advance democracy, φυλαί τε γὰρ ἕτεραι ποιηταί πλείους, κ. τ. λ.

²⁷ Τὰ τῶν ἰδίων ἱερῶν συνακτεῖον εἰς ὀλίγα καὶ κοινὰ, καὶ πάντα σοφιστίον, ὅπως ἂν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀναμιχθῶσι πάντες ἀλλήλοις, αἱ δὲ συνήθειαι διαζευχθῶσιν αἱ πρότερον. Compare, on the subject of proceedings of this description in the Pontic Heraclea, and in Byzantium, Æneas, Tact. 11, and Müller, Dor. 2. 171.

²⁸ Herod. 5. 70.

²⁹ Herod. 5. 72.

³⁰ Poll. 8. 31. Conf. Meier u. Schöm. Att. Pr. 115.

standing in intimate connection with the new order of things; the chiefs of the new Phylæ, called Phylarchs³¹, had a purely political tendency; the Phratrias and families were suffered to exist, but no longer in conjunction with the Phylæ; the union between them was dissolved³², and they from that time forth only served to watch over the genuineness of that citizenship which was acquired by birth, without regard to the general order amongst the citizens. The relation between the Trittyes and the Phylæ, like that between the Phratrias and the Phylæ, was dissolved in consequence of the alteration in the number of the last, and the former Trittyes appear to have been wholly abolished; instead of the forty-eight Naucrarias formerly included under them, fifty new ones were established, viz., five from every Phyle, forming a direct subdivision of the Phylæ³³. However, it was not intended that the Naucrarias should now constitute the principal division for the objects of the administration. The Demi were henceforward of almost universal application, on which account they are subsequently classed together with the new Trittyes³⁴. Before the time of Clisthenes

³¹ Herod. 5. 69: *δέκα φυλάρχους ἀντὶ τεσσέρων (?)*; Herod. was unacquainted with the ancient Phylbasileis. Conf. Tittmann, Gr. Staatsvf. 274. 275.

³² Thus Arist. Pol. 6. 4. 11, where the dissolution of the Phratrias is discussed, may be explained in a natural manner; and thus the question whether Clisthenes instituted new Phylæ or not, (see Schömann, Com. 365, and Platner, Beitr. 74. 77.) would appear to be set at rest; and this finally makes the Gennetæ, afterwards mentioned, (Platner 72), a remnant of the ancient 360 houses indeed, but without connecting them by any numerical link; and doubtless natural relationship now again supplanted political form as a means to bind them together.

³³ Cleidemus ap. Phot. *Ναυκραρ.*

³⁴ Æsch. in Ctes. 425: *αἱ φυλαὶ καὶ αἱ τριττύες καὶ οἱ δῆμοι*. Conf. Poll. 8. 108. These Trittyes are evidently divisions produced by subsequent circumstances. Conf. Demosth. de Synmor. 184; Böckh, Pub. Econ. 2. 107.

Demus was a community, township³⁵, village, hamlet, or borough, the residence of individual or several united families, whence the numerous patronymic denominations³⁶ were derived; Clisthenes ranged the whole of them under the ten Phylæ³⁷, but not in round numbers adopted for the sake of uniformity, and placed them in close relation with every department of the public administration. A sphere of operation was assigned to the presidents of the communities, the Demarchs³⁸, similar to that which the Naucrari had formerly possessed. The citizen was, in all his public dealings, e. g. in lawsuits, in the muster-roll, in the tax-book, etc., described according to his Demus, for which purpose lists were kept, in which natural-born citizens and naturalized aliens were enrolled in common³⁹.

Clisthenes likewise permitted naturalization⁴⁰, which is analogous to his endeavours in other respects to promote general citizenship at the expense of that which was obtained by birth; this, however, must only be understood with reference to his own time, but not as a measure intended to facilitate access to the citizenship in future. On the other hand, he is said to have originated the extraordinary proceeding for the ex-

³⁵ See Herod. 1. 60, 62; conf. Append. viii.

³⁶ Conf. Buttmann *üb. d. W. φρατρία*, 22.

³⁷ The assumption of a hundred Demi, ten for every Phyle, has arisen from a misinterpretation of the passage in Herodot. 5. 69: *δέκα δὲ καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατένεκε εἰς τὰς φυλάς*, with which must be connected *εἰς τὰς δέκα φυλάς*. See Schweighæuser *ibid.*, and the enumeration of the Demi which are known, (174 in number, see Strab. 9. 396, from Polemon,) in Meurs. de Popul. Att. in Gronov. Thes. 4. 673, sqq. Conf. the more critical attempt of Corsini, *f. Att.* 1. 5, and Müller, *Attica* in Ersch Encycl. 6. 222, sqq.

³⁸ Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 37; Poll. 8. 108; Harpocr. *δημαρχ.* (from Aristotle) and *νανκραρικά*. Conf. Tittmann, Gr. Staatsv. 276.

³⁹ *Ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον*. See § 46. n. 46.

⁴⁰ Aristot. Poll. 3. 1. 10: *Κλεισθένης—πολλοὺς—ἐφυλέτευσσε ξένους καὶ δοῦλους καὶ μετοίκους*; Wolf, without reason, wishes to expunge the second καὶ.

pulsion of a citizen, termed Ostracism⁴¹. This abuse of Solon's measure for passing a decree⁴² against an individual, by collecting the votes of six thousand citizens, was destined by Clisthenes to prevent the rise of a new tyranny. This monstrous excrescence of democratic surveillance was the ever-ready tool of envy⁴³ and party-spirit, and became a means to expel citizens, who, however excellent their character in other respects, appeared to enjoy a dangerous pre-eminence over the mass of the people. The limitation of the banishment to a certain number of years, generally ten, does not render the principle less odious.

Clisthenes does not seem to have altered the arrangement of the classes instituted by Solon; Aristides was the first to deprive the Pentacosioimeditni of the exclusive privilege of eligibility to the archonship.

The political authorities, in their most essential features, remained unchanged, as did their position with respect to each other; but the organization of the ten Phylæ effected a most extensive alteration in forms. The council now consisted of five hundred members, fifty from every Phyle; the charge of official business and the presidency

⁴¹ *Æl. V. H. 13. 24.* Aristot. *Pol. 3. 8. 3*, says, as if in jest, that Hercules was ostracised by the Argonauts; Photius *Myriob. Cod. 190. p. 152.* Bekk. Ἀχιλλεύς ὁ Δύσωνος ὁ τὸν ὀστρακισμὸν ἐπινοήσας (?). Clisthenes himself is stated to have been its first victim, *Æl. ubi sup.*; in Harpocr. "Ἰππαρχος, (from Androtion, conf. Phot. Suid. "Ἰππαρχος), Hipparchus, the son of Charmus, a relation of Pisistratus. Conf. *Plut. Nic. 11.* The Στηλίου Hipparchus, the son of Timarchus, ap. *Lycurg. c. Leocrat.* is not alluded to here. Compare at large Meier de Bon. 97. 312; Tittmann, *Gr. Staatsv.* 341, sqq.

⁴² § 47. n. 22. It appears to me that the majority of the 6000 who composed the court decided; when it concerned a single individual, their sentence was definitive; when several, then he against whom the largest majority voted was banished.

⁴³ *Plut. Them. 22:* κόλασις οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλὰ παραμυθία φθόνου καὶ κούφισμός. Conf. *Plut. Alcib. 13; Poll. 8. 20.*

were annexed to successive Prytanies, of which there were ten in the year; each of these consisted of fifty Buleutæ, and lasted thirty-five or thirty-six days; every Prytany was divided into Proedrias of ten Buleutæ each, and lasted seven or eight days, whilst a fresh Epistates was chosen daily⁴⁴. Nine Proedri were appointed assessors for every meeting of the council or people, as antagonist officers of the Proedri; they were taken from the nine Phylæ which did not hold the Prytany at the time. This apparently had no further influence upon the popular assembly, than that the number of the sittings in each Prytany was increased⁴⁵, and that a change of presidency took place. Neither did the Heliæa undergo any further change than was produced by the alteration in the Phylæ; the six thousand Heliasts, according to Solon's regulation about five hundred from each of the twelve Trittyes, were appointed by lot from the Phylæ, six hundred from each⁴⁶; the number of the places where the courts were held corresponded with that of the Phylæ, although there was no intimate connection between them⁴⁷. The plan for remodelling the courts of the Ephetæ and the Prytaneum has been already adverted to⁴⁸. Amongst the superior magistrates, the Archons, who had hitherto been elective, were, like most of the others, henceforward appointed by lot⁴⁹; but the number of the

⁴⁴ Argum. Dem. in Androt. 589, sqq., and Schol. 95. Sch. Dem. in Timocr. 104; conf. 133. (from Aristotle); Sch. Æsch. in Ctesiph. 765. Suidas, *πρυτανεία*; Harpocr. *πρόεδροι*. Corsini f. Att. 1. diss. 6. 268. Lüzac de Epistat. et Proedr.; Schöm. Com. 85, sqq.; Tittmann, Gr. Staatsvf. 240—243.

⁴⁵ Conf. § 47. n. 14.

⁴⁶ See § 47. n. 29.

⁴⁷ Meier u. Schöm. Att. Pr. 127, sqq.

⁴⁸ See § 45. n. 33.

⁴⁹ See the Clisthenic intercalation in the oath of the Heliasts, Dem. in

Archons continued the same, and the Dokimasia of the magistrates in general remained unchanged. The remaining functionaries, like the Phylæ, became more numerous; the number ten from this time prevailed in every department of the administration. There were afterwards ten Strategi, Taxiarchs, and Phylarchs; ten Tamiæ, Apodectæ (in the place of the ancient Colagretæ), Poletæ; ten Logistæ⁵⁰, etc., whereby a larger field was opened to ambition. How many of these new magistrates were appointed by Clisthenes himself is doubtful, but it is less probable that he himself instituted the many magistracies which necessarily resulted from the division of the Phylæ, than that he laid the foundation of that system which afterwards furnished a convenient pretext for cupidity and ambition to create as many magistrates as suited their designs.

THE TYRANNY.

I. SURVEY OF THE TYRANTS TILL ABOUT THE TIME OF THE PERSIAN WARS.

§ 49. From the middle of the seventeenth century before the Christian era till towards the middle of the fifth, a remarkable phenomenon is presented in the history of the Grecian states. Many of those con-

Timocr. 747. 3: ὅσαι μετὰ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων κυαμεύονται. The earliest mention of sortition occurs in Herod. 6. 109, in the case of the Polemarch at Marathon, ὁ τῷ κυάμῳ λαχών. Compare, on the subject of the magistrates, both elective and such as were appointed by lot, Tittmann, Griech. Staatsv. 311, sqq.

⁵⁰ See the ample enumeration in Tittmann, 302. 303; and on the subject of the ten reputed Thesmothetæ, Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 277, and Vesp. 772; conf. Tittmann, 239. 262—265. 302; and on the other side of the question, Meier u. Schöm. Att. Pr. 59. n.

stitutions which had succeeded the authority of the kings, were overthrown by bold and energetic men, and monarchical governments were re-established in their stead, and in some instances transmitted to the descendants of their founders.

The earliest example is that of Sicyon. In the twenty-seventh Olympiad Orthagoras, according to the tradition, at one time a cook¹, obtained possession of the government, and his descendants retained the same for the space of a hundred years². The genealogy of the Orthagoridæ is as follows: Andreus, Myron, Aristonymus, Clisthenes³. Æschines⁴, a Sicyonian tyrant, was subsequently overthrown by the Spartans. The subsistence of the institutions of Clisthenes till about the time of Æschines⁵, does not enable us to conclude with certainty that the tyranny continued in being during the period that intervened between them.

Almost contemporaneously with Orthagoras, about Ol. 31⁶, arose Cypselus in Corinth⁷, who expelled the Bacchiadæ, and reigned thirty years. He was succeeded by Periander, who extended his dominion over Corcyra⁸; the next was Psammetichus⁹. The Cypselidæ reigned in all between seventy and eighty years¹⁰.

¹ Liban. 3. 251. Reisk.; conf. Wytttenbach ad Plut. de Sera Num. Vindict. 45. This corresponds with his being called the son of Κοπρέυς (from κόπρος, manure), Plut. ubi sup., 8. 188.

² Arist. Pol. 5. 9. 21.

³ Plut. ubi sup. 8. 187. Conf. Paus. 2. 8. 1, where Myron must be read instead of Pyrrho, and 6. 19. 2.

⁴ Plut. de Herod. Malig. 9. 411.

⁵ Herod. 5. 68.

⁶ Corsini F. A. 3. 48. 49.

⁷ Herod. 5. 92; Aristot. Poll. 5. 9. 22.

⁸ Herod. 5. 92, and 3. 48, sqq.

⁹ Arist. Poll. 5. 9. 22, he is called the son of Gordias; more correctly perhaps of Gorgus, the brother or son of Cypselus. Conf. Müller, Ægin. 66. n. i.; Dor. 2. 155. n.

¹⁰ The numbers assigned in Aristotle are incorrect: Cypselus 30 years, Periander 44, Psammetichus 3, make 77 years, and not 73½, which Aristotle

In the time of Cypselus, Gorgus¹¹, his son or brother¹², migrated, and founded Ambracia, where he ruled as tyrant; he was followed by a Periander¹³, whom it is necessary to distinguish from the Corinthian of that name. The age of a third, Phalæcus¹⁴, is unknown.

In the time of Periander, Procles, his father-in-law, was tyrant of Epidaurus¹⁵; Theagenes, whose daughter was married to Cylon the Athenian, ruled in Megara¹⁶; the former was expelled by Periander¹⁷, and the latter by the Megarian people¹⁸ shortly after the failure of Cylon's attempt to obtain the tyranny, Ol. 42. 1.

In Pisa, which had fallen off from Elis, about the twenty-sixth Olympiad, tyranny likewise arose at an early period. Pantaleon, who as tyrant celebrated the Olympic games¹⁹, Ol. 34, was succeeded by his son Demophoon, and afterwards by his brother Pyrrhus²⁰; the last seems to have been conquered by the Eleans, as Pisa again became subject to their dominion.

A Eubœan tyrant, called Tynnondas, of Bœotian name, is said to have lived before Solon's

states as the total amount; Schneider only allows 40 years to Periander; Müller, Dor. 1. 168. 1; 76 years and 6 months to all three; Götting (ad Arist. Poll. p. 168.) will not acknowledge Psammetichus as a Cypselid (?).

¹¹ Strab. 7. 325, incorrectly says Τόλγου; 10. 452, Γαργάσου; Anton. Lib. 4, Τόργος; Plut. Sept. Sap. Conviv. 6. 610, Γοργίας. The emendation Gorgus is recommended by the analogy of the Messenian name (Paus. 4. 23. 1.), as well as the Cnidian (Diod. 5. 9.), and the Cyprian (Herod. 5. 116).

¹² Son, Plut. ubi sup. Scymn. 454; Brother, Neanthes ap. Diog. L. 1. 98.

¹³ Aristot. Poll. 5. 8. 9; Plut. Amator. Nar. 9. 79.

¹⁴ Antonin. Lib. 4.

¹⁵ Herod. 3. 30; Diog. L. 1. 94. 100. The reading Patrocles in Paus. 2. 28. 4, is corrupt. Conf. Müll. Ægin. 64. 66.

¹⁶ Thuc. 1. 126; Aristot. Pol. 5. 4. 5.

¹⁷ Herod. 3. 52.

¹⁸ Plut. Qu. Græc. 7. 163; conf. Corsini F. A. 3. 64. 65; Meier, de Bon. Damn. 4. n. 9.

¹⁹ Paus. 6. 22. 2; conf. concerning him, 6. 21. 1; Heracl. Pont. 6.

²⁰ Paus. 6. 22. 2; 5. 16. 4. 5; Str. 8. 355.

time²¹; Antileon in Chalcis appears to have been the last of that line of princes; after his time aristocracy was established²².

Leon, a tyrant of Phlius, is mentioned in the history of Pythagoras, amongst his contemporaries²³.

The accounts of a Phocian tyrant, called Daulis²⁴, and of a female dynast, Perimede or Choira, in Tegea²⁵, who are both referred to the earlier age, must be regarded with suspicion. Symmachus²⁶, the tyrant of Thasus, said to have been expelled by Sparta, probably appertains to the time of Agesilaus²⁷.

The last tyrants of the Grecian continent were the house of the Athenian Pisistratus; he himself first became tyrant, Ol. 54. 4, after which he was twice expelled by the Alcmaeonidæ, and it was not till Ol. 60. 1, that he succeeded in establishing his authority. He was succeeded by his sons Hippias and Hipparchus, Ol. 63. 1, and after the murder of the latter, Ol. 66. 3, Hippias reigned alone till his expulsion by the Alcmaeonidæ and Cleomenes, in the fourth year after the death of Hipparchus²⁸. Connected with Pisistratus and

²¹ Plut. Sol. 14.

²² Aristot. Pol. 5. 10. 3.

²³ Heracl. P. ap. Diog. L. 1. 12, and 8. 8; Cic. Tusc. 5. 3.

²⁴ The statement of Ephorus ap. Strab. 6. 265, that the Crissæan tyrant Daulis sent a colony to Metapontum, as containing the name of a place, must be referred to the mythical age and poetry, like Crisus, the founder of Crisa, in the Schol. Villos. on the catalogue of ships in Hom. 27. From the former arose Aulis, in the perplexed collection of matter in Plut. de Herod. Malig. 9. 411. The character and age of a Phocian tyrant called Execestus, the possessor of two magic rings (Aristot. ap. Clem. Al. Strom. 1. 334 B. ed. Morell,) are enveloped in obscurity.

²⁵ Dindorf, Grammat. Gr. 8. 13, sqq. from Deinias.

²⁶ Plut. ubi sup.

²⁷ A Thasian Symmachus fought under Agesilaus. Polyæn. 2. 1. 27.

²⁸ Conf. at large Meursius, Pisistratus.

Polycrates in Samos was Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos²⁹.

Tyrants arose in Ionia at the same time that Gyges began to reign in Lydia, and perhaps not without some connection with that circumstance. The expiring monarchy, viz., the government of Thoas and Damasenor, appears to have been disguised under the name of tyranny in Miletus; this was followed by aristocracy³⁰. Thrasybulus, the antagonist of Alyattes the Lydian, Periander's contemporary and counsellor³¹, was, properly speaking, a tyrant whose authority had issued from the overweening power annexed to the Prytanic dignity³². Pindar in Ephesus, the son of Alyattes' daughter³³, must also rather be regarded as one of the Basileis than a tyrant; but in the age of Cræsus he was followed by the real tyrant Pythagoras, who subverted the government of the Basilidæ³⁴. The Ephesians called the Athenian Aristarchus to their assistance against Pythagoras; but he too, about the time of the revolt of Cyrus against Astyages, exercised despotic power³⁵, but possibly only in the capacity of Æsymnete.

In the same manner the line of demarcation between the last princes of the stock of the Proclidæ and the tyrants in the history of Samos cannot be accurately distinguished. To the former apparently belongs Amphicrates, who carried on

²⁹ He is called the *ξεναγός* of Pisistratus, Herod. 1. 61. 64; from which Plut. de Herod. Malig. 9. 411, must be emended. Compare, concerning him, § 35. n. 46; and on his relation to Polycrates, Polyæn. 1. 23. 2.

³⁰ Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 193; conf. § 35. n. 74.

³¹ Aristot. Pol. 5. 4. 5.

³² Herod. 1. 20—23; 5. 92. 6; Aristot. Pol. 3. 8. 3.

³³ Ælian. V. H. 3. 26; Polyæn. 6. 50.

³⁴ Baton ap. Suid. Πυθαγόρας.

³⁵ Suid. Ἀρίσταρχος.

a war with Ægina³⁶; it cannot be ascertained whether Damoteles³⁷, the autocrat before Polycrates, was the last of the princes, or whether he obtained the tyranny through demagogy. After his murder it is not impossible that, notwithstanding the seditious struggles for power amongst the people, the Geomori maintained their ground till they were overthrown by the sons of Æaces, Polycrates, Syloson, and Pantagnotus, who were probably generals³⁸. Polycrates alone became tyrant, and likewise ruled over the Cyclades³⁹. Soon after his death, a short time before the government of Darius Hystaspes⁴⁰, Samos fell under the power of Persia.

The tyranny which subsisted in the Grecian states of Asia, after the commencement of the Persian domination, was less the offspring of their own political system than a Persian satrapy⁴¹. Tyrants of this description were Polycrates' brother Syloson, who expelled the successor of Polycrates, Mæandrius and his son Æaces⁴², by means of Persian soldiers; Cadmus in the island of Cos⁴³, Strattis in Chios⁴⁴, Hippocles in Lampsacus⁴⁵, Coes in Mitylene⁴⁶, Histiaëus and Aristagoras in Miletus⁴⁷, etc. Similar rulers

³⁶ Herod. 3. 59; conf. Panofka res Sam. 26.

³⁷ § 35. n. 43.

³⁸ Herod. 3. 39; Polyæn. 1. 23. 2. That which is recorded by Polyæn. 6. 44, relates to the attack of the commander of the fleet against the Geomori, alluded to above (§ 35. n. 43). It is difficult to explain why Panofka should place the Syloson there mentioned, the son of Calliteles, before Damoteles.

³⁹ Her. 3. 39, sqq.; 3. 121, sqq.; Thuc. 1. 14.

⁴⁰ This results from Herod. 3. 126, sqq. On the difficulties presented by the chronology in other respects, consult Panofka 29, sqq.

⁴¹ On Cuma, Heracl. Pont. 11, says: Κύρος δὲ καταλύσας τὴν πολιτείαν μοναρχεῖσθαι (ἀντ') αὐτῆς ἐποίησεν.

⁴² Herod. 3. 142, sqq.; conf. Panofka; 45, sqq.

⁴³ Herod. 7. 164.

⁴⁴ Herod. 8. 132; conf. Schneider ad Arist. Pol. 5. 5. 4.

⁴⁵ Thuc. 5. 59.

⁴⁶ Herod. 4. 97; 5. 11.

⁴⁷ See others, Herod. 4. 138; 5. 37.

became the successors of the ancient dynasts⁴⁸ in Cyprus, amongst whom Philocyprus has become renowned as the friend of Solon⁴⁹. Mardonius, with that arbitrary mode of procedure which a Persian general was not afraid to adopt, expelled the whole of the tyrants of the Ionian and Æolian states⁵⁰; but soon afterwards they again appear⁵¹.

Lastly, in Sicily the tyranny had the most prosperous career; Syracuse in particular not only followed the example of the mother-city, Corinth, but even surpassed it, and that at a time when the last tyrant of the Grecian continent, Hippias of Athens, had been expelled, and popular freedom was advancing with rapid strides. The first of the list is Phalaris in Agrigentum⁵², Ol. 53. 4—57. 3; he was succeeded there by Alcamenes and Alcander⁵³, apparently rather Æsymnetæ than tyrants; afterwards Theron⁵⁴, who probably inherited from his father Ænesidemus the tyranny of Leontini, where, in an early age, Panætius⁵⁵ had been tyrant⁵⁶; but marching from Agrigentum he afterwards expelled⁵⁷ the tyrant Texillus of Himera, the son-in-law of Anaxilas the Rhegian, and likewise reigned over Himera. His son Thrasydæus was expelled (Ol. 76. 4) by the Agrigentans⁵⁸. Pythagoras was tyrant of Selinus at the time the noble Dorieus came from Sparta to Sicily (Ol. 65. 2); the com-

⁴⁸ Herod. 5. 104. 110.

⁴⁹ Herod. 5. 113.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 6. 43.

⁵¹ Ibid. 8. 85.

⁵² Concerning his age see Bentley; on the manner in which he gained the tyranny, Arist. Poll. 3. 8. 4; Polyæn. 5. 1. 1. We cannot here notice the innumerable allusions made to him in other places.

⁵³ Heracl. Pont. 36.

⁵⁴ Herod. 7. 165; Polyæn. 6. 51; Böckh, expl. Pind. 117, sqq.

⁵⁵ Panætius the first tyrant of Sicily occurs in Euseb. Ol. 43. 1; he is placed in Leontini by Aristot. Poll. 5. 8. 4; 5. 10. 4.

⁵⁶ Pausan. 5. 22. 4; conf. Böckh, ubi sup.

⁵⁷ Herod. 5. 46.

⁵⁸ Diod. 11. 53; Böckh, ubi sup. 208.

panion of the latter, Euryleon, deposed Pythagoras, and then reigned over Minoa⁵⁹, as well as Selinus. The civil dissensions in Gela ended with the tyranny of Cleander⁶⁰ (Ol. 68. 4); he was (Ol. 70. 3) succeeded by his brave brother Hippocrates, who reduced Zancle⁶¹, where Scythes, the father of Cadmus, the subsequent tyrant of Cos, had ruled before; he was followed by Gelon. He transferred (Ol. 73. 4) the tyranny to Syracuse, whither he brought back the expelled Geomori, and extended his authority far around, over Megara, Eubœa⁶², etc.; after him governed Hiero and then Thrasybulus, his brothers. The latter of these was driven out by the people⁶³ (Ol. 78. 3.)

Lower Italy likewise had its tyrants; Anaxilas in Rhegium⁶⁴ in Ol. 71. 4; after him, Ol. 76. 1, his noble-minded slave Smicythus, guardian of the children of Anaxilas⁶⁵, who were expelled soon after their accession to power⁶⁶; Clinias in Croton, after the dissolution of the Pythagorean league (?)⁶⁷; Telys in Sybaris, originally a demagogue hostile to the nobility⁶⁸; Nearchus or Demylus⁶⁹ in Elea, Ol. 70; and in the Campanian Cuma, Aristodemus or Malacus, who was contemporary with the younger Tarquin⁷⁰.

⁵⁹ Herod. 5. 46.

⁶⁰ Herod. 7. 153; Aristot. Poll. 5. 10. 4.

⁶¹ Herod. 6. 23. 24.

⁶² Herod. 7. 155. 156.

⁶³ Diod. 11. 38. 67; Aristot. Poll. 5. 8. 19.

⁶⁴ Arist. Poll. 5. 10. 4; Herod. 6. 23. 24; Justin. 4. 2.

⁶⁵ Herod. 7. 170; Diod. 11. 66.

⁶⁶ Diod. 11. 76.

⁶⁷ Dionys. Hal. Fragm. v. 19. 4, he is classed with Anaxilas.

⁶⁸ Herod. 6. 44; Heracl. Pont. ap. Ath. 521 F.

⁶⁹ Clem. Alex. Strom. 4. 496 D. ed. Morell.; Plut. de Stoicor. Repugn. 10. 345. He is named Diomedon by Diog. L. 9. 26. He caused the philosopher Zeno of Elea to be tortured and put to death, Plut. de Garrul. 8. 13; Diog. L. 9. 25, and Menage ad eund. He was afterwards expelled by the people, 9. 27.

⁷⁰ Dionys. Hal. 7. 4, sqq.; Diod. Fragm. v. 4. 16. Bipont.

II. THE TYRANNY IN ALLIANCE WITH THE LOWER ORDERS.

§ 50. It is necessary to distinguish the tyranny of the age before the Persian wars, from that which subsequently arose, in the same manner as the aristocracy of the earlier time, from the oligarchy of the later; most of the Greek writers direct their attention exclusively to the last of these as partly contemporaneous with, and directly familiar to them; wherefore we are unable to derive from their accounts either a true notion of the nature of the ancient tyranny in itself, or of the place it held in the estimation of the people of the age in which it flourished. The tyranny must be regarded as one of the chief links in the chain of gradually expanding political phenomena, as a system grounded on the preceding order of things, and as a manifestation of one widely-diffused spirit of the age. As such, it was a means to substitute unlimited autocracy¹ for responsible magistracies, and it is necessary to guard against the error of supposing it to have been an immediate continuation or a degeneration of the princely power of the early age, as republican institutions in fact formed the link by which it was connected with the ancient monarchy. Hence kings, like Phidon of Argos, and Charilaus of Sparta, could only be denominated tyrants improperly, and in consequence of their authority having been less limited than that

¹ The *ἀνυπεύθυνον* is very minutely explained by Str. 6. 158: *αὐτοκρατῆς βασιλεία καὶ ἀνυπεύθυνος ἐξουσία αὐτοτελής*.—Herodotus employs *Μοῦναρχος, μουνναρχέω* in speaking of kings and tyrants: 5. 46. 59. 61; 6. 23. 24; 7. 154. 165; but he likewise applies *ἀνδράσι μουνάρχοισι* to the Bacchiads in an oracle, 5. 92. 2. Herewith compare 3. 80. *ἔνα — μούναρχον — μούνον*.

of their predecessors²; moreover, the republican constitutions which were supplanted by the tyranny, were not, as several of the ancients represent³, fully developed and confirmed democracies, nor on the other hand firmly-rooted aristocracies, reposing on the apathetic indifference or servile endurance of the lower orders; in many instances they were the disjointed forms of an aristocracy brought to dissolution no less by internal dissension than by the hostility of the aspiring demus; therefore, in opposition to *Æsymnety*⁴, which is exhibited in the light of an amicable compromise, and as originating with the governing order⁵, the establishment of a tyranny is generally described as having been attended by stratagem or force, the appointment of bodyguards, the maintenance of mercenaries, the capture of the citadel⁶, etc.; and lastly, even where, as in Athens after Solon's time, a legal rank and determinate rights were secured to the bulk of the people, the main-spring of such undertakings nevertheless for the most part existed in the character of the lower orders, wherein the tyranny possessed a kindred element, and was consequently seldom or never established in opposi-

² Arist. Poll. 5. 10. 3.

³ e. g. Corn. Nep. Milt. 8: Omnes autem habentur et dicuntur tyranni, qui potestate sunt perpetua in ea civitate, quæ libertate usa est.

⁴ Conf. § 39. n. 15—18.

⁵ This is the essential mark of distinction. Aristotle, indeed, says (Arg. Soph. *Ædip. Tyr.*) that the tyrants were at first called *Æsymnetæ*; but this cannot strictly apply to the change in the denomination, but must rather be understood of the essential nature of the two stages of monarchical government which succeeded that of the kings generally, without regard to the source of power. To this, therefore, should probably be referred the general observation, Pol. 5. 8. 3, that tyrants arose, *ἐκ τῶν ὀλιγαρχιῶν αἰρουμένων ἕνα τινὰ κύριον ἐπὶ τὰς μεγίστας ἀρχάς*. There can be no doubt that Aristotle's remark referred, amongst others, to the first magistrate in the *Æolian Cuma* (§ 38. n. 44), for the fragment is taken from the *Cumæan Politeia*. Conf. Polit. 4. 8. 2.

⁶ Herod. 1. 59; Dionys. Hal. 7. 4; Thuc. 1. 126.

tion to their wishes. Gelon, indeed, marched at the head of the noble Gamori of Syracuse, against the demus by which they had been expelled, and subdued it⁷; but that was not a tyranny springing from the very heart of the political system of Syracuse, but a coalition between foreign ambition and the designs of a domestic faction, and it is impossible to put any other construction on his continued treatment of the demus of Megara and Eubœa⁸ in the spirit of Syracusan party. In consequence of being extended over several cities, his tyranny was of an unusual character; he did not support himself by means of the demus as such⁹, but as the population of his capital was mixed, and collected together from various cities, he mainly relied upon military force.

But the tyranny did not derive its sole support from the hatred of the lower orders to the governing class by which they had been expelled, and on which account they willingly lent themselves to the factious purposes of the demagogues¹⁰; this ardent desire to throw off the detested yoke of the nobles, was combined with a feeling which centuries had not been able to extinguish, viz. a natural preference for the unity of the sovereign power, the incontestable advantage of monarchy over the many-headed domination of haughty and exclusive nobles. This attachment to the former hereditary sovereignty which lived in the remembrance of the people as a mild and paternal administration, and to which was ascribed as its pecu-

⁷ Herod. 7. 155.

⁸ Herod. 7. 156.

⁹ Herod. ubi sup. : νομίσας δῆμον εἶναι συνοίκημα ἀχαριώτατον.

¹⁰ Arist. Poll. 5. 4. 5 : ἡ δὲ πίστις ἦν ἡ ἀπὲχθαια πρὸς τοὺς πλουσίους. Conf. 5. 8. 2. 3.

liar characteristic that it dispensed benefits, and did not suffer injustice in the land¹¹, was supported by the legendary lore of the heroic age, and acquired new force when demagogues added to the popularity they gained by their munificence and distinguished personal qualities the advantage of being descended from the line of the ancient kings, as was the case with Pisistratus¹². Hence, in the divisions amongst the orders, the demus did not so much aim at securing for itself independence and participation in the government, as at placing a monarch upon the throne; and far from cavilling about the ultimate grounds of abstract right, only looked to the prosperity of the community, and desired to be governed by him to whom it attributed the greatest strength, wisdom, and moderation. For this reason the Athenian demus asked Solon to be tyrant¹³, and the Agrigentans expressed a similar wish with regard to Empedocles¹⁴. Therefore the gathering of large bodies of the people around the demagogues, was not solely occasioned by the distractions of faction, nor was the tyranny which resulted from the struggle, a mere advantage reaped by the watchfulness of egotism, or a failure of democratic policy, which, after ridding itself of the aristocracy, had to deplore the substitution of a greater evil in the tyranny of the demagogue; on the contrary, the political calculations of the demus had their final end and aim in the undivided power of an able sovereign.

¹¹ Arist. Poll. 3. 9. 4; 5. 8. 5.

¹² Herod. 5. 65.

¹³ Plut. Sol. 14.

¹⁴ Aristot. ap. Diog. L. 8. 63. The account of the expression of a similar wish on the part of the Athenian populace, with regard to Alcibiades, would appear to be one of the numerous transpositions, Plut. Alcib. 34.

Hence the successful tyrant could not be regarded by the people in the light of a natural enemy. In forming their estimate of a tyranny, as far as a consideration of the principles of political law can be ascribed to the simplicity of the multitude, they did not search after the roots of that authority, or take into consideration the usurpation and suppression of the just claims of the people at large to a share in the supreme power, but looked to the character of the government itself, its administration of justice, respect for the rights of property, wisdom, and incorruptibility. This estimation of the tyranny, according to the use it made of power, was not only exhibited in the unconscious and undefined feelings of the mass, but even in the intercourse of sages with good and able tyrants. Solon, regardless of the legal grounds on which the title of Philocyprus rested, took delight in his society, and extolled him in his poetry¹⁵, because he was a just man. Illustrious poets, Pindar and Æschylus, Simonides and Anacreon, Bacchylides, Ibycus, and Arion also, resided with tyrants¹⁶. This explains the praise so unanimously expressed of Pisistratus¹⁷, whose authority, established almost immediately after the body of the people acquired a share in the highest power, rendered itself so grateful to the demus by the dispensation of justice, and by royal solicitude for the welfare of the

¹⁵ See § 49. n. 49.

¹⁶ See my *Progr. de Pindaro Reip. Constit. Præceptore Disp.* 2. p. 17, sqq. It is absurd to construe the selfish tirade of Alcæus against Pittacus into a patriotic hostility to tyrants. This character might more justly be ascribed to his poem on the death of Myrsilus, *Athen.* 10. 430. C.

¹⁷ See in particular *Thucyd.* 6. 54. The silly Scolion indeed says, that Thucydides perhaps extolled the Pisistratids because he himself belonged to their family!

subject in every department of political life ; hence the encomiums passed on Gelon¹⁸, who was by no means favourably disposed towards the demus ; thus paternal indulgence and affability were the support of these potentates generally, so that many of them could mingle in the ranks of the people unattended by guards¹⁹. Lastly, this serves to explain how the word *tyrannus* was only used originally to designate a ruler²⁰, without any invidious secondary meaning ; while *tyrannus*, as applied to the kings of the early age²¹, and *basileus* for a tyrant²², were still employed promiscuously after the full development of democracy. The distinction between *tyrannus* as something odious, and *basileus* as an object worthy of love and affection²³, was an immediate result of the departure of the tyranny from the paternal system of kingly government. This being blended with the opinions of subsequent politicians on the subject of popular rights, the character it assumed acquired greater

¹⁸ Diod. 11. 38, πολλήν εὐνομίαν, κ. τ. λ.

¹⁹ Concerning Cypselus, see Arist. Pol. 5. 7. 22. sqq. ; on Gelon, see Diod. 11. 26 : Ælian, V. H. 6. 11 ; 13. 36 ; on Theron, see Diod. F. v. 4. 66. Bipont.

²⁰ The word first occurs in Archilochus, Plut. de Tranquill. Anim. 7. 839 ; Argum. Soph. (Ed. Tyr. Schol. Æschyl. Prometh. 224. Archilochus appears to have applied it to the Lydian prince Gyges, (a usurper, it is true, Herod. 1. 11.) see Herod. 1. 12, and Valcken.

²¹ See the Tragedians ; also Herod. 1. 7. on the Lydian Candaules ; 8. 137. on the ancient kingship in general, and on the Macedonian in particular.

²² For examples, see more especially Herod. 3. 52 ; it is applied to Periander, 5. 27 ; Mæandrius, 5. 44 ; Telys, 5. 109. 110 ; the Cyprian Tyrants, 6. 23 ; Scythes, 5. 35, Aristagoras. Cypselus is also saluted by the title of βασιλεὺς κλεινοῖο Κορίνθου, in an oracular response, 5. 92. 5 ; Βασιλεὺς, and immediately afterwards τύραννος, 5. 113 ; βασιλεὺς, τύραννος, and μούναρχος, 6. 23 ; Thucydides, 1. 13, distinguishes between τυραννίδες and πατρικαὶ βασιλείαι ; conf. Schol. ; Eupolis called Pisistratus βασιλεὺς, see Ammon. τύραννος. On the promiscuous use of the words, see Schol. Aristoph. Ach. 61.

²³ This is perceptible even in the Etym. M. : Βασιλεὺς βάσιν ἵλης (!) ἔχων, τουτέστι μετὰ τοῦ πλήθους ποιούμενος τὴν βάσιν καὶ τὴν ἔξοδον· δεῖ γὰρ ἀληθῶς βασιλεία καλοποιεῖν· ὁ δὲ κακοποιῶν τύραννος.

odium in proportion as those opinions became more violent ²⁴.

III. TYRANNY IN THE LIGHT OF DESPOTISM.

§ 51. That mode of government which has associated the word tyrant with universal reprobation, and, amongst the Greeks, caused the authority annexed to it to be contrasted with the ancient monarchy as a despotism enforced by hired task-masters and myrmidons, a dereliction of all paternal and benevolent dispositions, unnatural oppression and cruelty, a violation of all laws, divine and human¹, etc., was, it must be confessed, no more wholly foreign to the spirit of the ancient tyranny, than a degeneracy of the nobility was to the early aristocracy; and the name of Phalaris has descended to us branded by history. Now, although it has been customary to class these characteristics together, as the universal qualities of the tyranny, and a similarity in the political position of the tyrants and the character of the age may have led to a certain uniformity in their proceedings, still the single touches of the picture are applicable to individual tyrants of the earlier age in part only, and in a subdued light. For we may plainly perceive, in the delineation of the character of Aristodemus, by Dionysius of Halicarnassus², that as battles were described by

²⁴ As in Polyb. 2. 59. αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦνομα περιέχει τὴν ἀσεβειστάτην ἔμφασιν καὶ πάσας περιείληφε τὰς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀδικίας καὶ παρανομίας. Hence in Hesych. Τύραννος ἀρχὼν ἀπηνῆς καὶ ἀπάνθρωπος, and Poll. 6. 151, are classed together, where we must, however, enquire whether the confusion between τύραννος and τυρόρηνός, mentioned Append. v., has not caused the character of the tyrants to be viewed in a more odious light, and occasioned this association. Conf. at large the first chapter in Ebert. Dissertationes Siculæ, Regimontii, 1825.

¹ See Aristot. Pol. 5. 2. 3—10; 5. 8. 6. 7; conf. Plat. Repub. 8. 562. A. sqq. ² Dionys. 7. 7.

Diodorus from imagination, and orations sometimes composed with the same license of invention, so it became customary to draw a certain vague and general picture of the tyrants instead of describing their real peculiarities³. Thus the conduct of one was attributed to another; and even when certain particulars were ascribed to the proper owners, various additions were made for the purpose of swelling up the catalogue of their crimes⁴, so that it is scarcely possible to distinguish truth from falsehood in the exaggerated accounts that have been propagated⁵.

The zealous endeavour to secure and maintain the tyranny, may be accounted the root of benignant and mild, as well as of rigorous and cruel conduct in the tyrants. So far, therefore, as the chief object of their government, either mediately or immediately, was to provide for the security of the tyranny, they are justly chargeable with selfishness⁶. But this is very far from implying that the tyrants appropriated to themselves all that was

³ Compare with the description of Dionysius, that given by Hippias, of the tyranny in Erythræ, Athen. 6. 259. C. D; that of Theopompus of Hegesilochus' conduct in Rhodes, Ath. 10. 444. F.; and Heracl. p. 31, of a tyrant said to have resided in Cephallenia, who only allowed two festivals annually, permitted no stranger to reside for more than ten days in the city, asserted the right of the first night, etc.

⁴ A parallel instance occurs in Euseb. Chr. 1470, where see Cedren. 1198: Ταρκύνιος Σούπερβος—ἐξέυρε δεσμὰ, μάστιγας, ξύλα, εἰρκτάς, φυλακάς, κλοιούς, πίδαας, ἀλύσεις, ἐξορίας, μέταλλα; a just estimate of this unhistorical mode of accumulating matter, is conveyed by the excellent observation of Polybius ap. Constantin. Porphyrogenit. Exc. Virt. et Vit. (Polyb. Schweigh. 7. 7.) "The historians have related a great deal concerning the cruelty of this Hieronymus, but he must have been too young to deserve it, ἀλλὰ μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ τὰς ἐπὶ μέρος γράφοντες πράξεις, ἐπειδὴν ὑποθέσεις εὐπεριλέπτους ὑποστήσωνται καὶ στενὰς, πτωχεύοντες πραγμάτων ἀναγκάζεσθαι τὰ μικρὰ μεγάλα ποιεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν μηδὲ μνήμης ἀξίων πολλοὺς τίνας διατίθεσθαι λόγους."

⁵ Thus Clearchus, ap. Ath. 9. 396. F., asserts that Phalaris devoured unweaned infants.

⁶ Aristot. Pol. 4. 8. 3: τυραννίδα—ἥτις—ἄρχει—πρὸς τὸ σφέτερον αὐτῆς συμφέρον, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων.

good and desirable, and revelled in princely luxury themselves, whilst the state derived no benefits whatever from their authority. It was, moreover, peculiar to that mode of government to establish the will and pleasure of the sovereign as the supreme law. But this was not attended by the abolition of all legal institutes; the constitution of Solon continued to exist, in form, under the Pisis-tratidæ; their attacks were not so much directed against law and prescription, as against the power and influence of rank, which had till then prevailed. This chiefly affected the nobility; hence it became a universal characteristic of the tyranny to abolish or remodel⁷ those forms which supported their authority, to humble them⁸, to reduce them as nearly as possible to the level of the other citizens, and to make all honour and importance in the state solely dependent upon the will and pleasure of the tyrant. This last proceeding degenerated into the most reckless violation of personal rights in the conduct of Polycrates, who despoiled his citizens of their property, in order to restore it to them under the name of donations⁹, thus making every thing a concession of royal favour. But the marked opposition of the tyranny to the nobility, proves that measures for oppressing or enfeebling the lower orders are, partly, not attributable to the ancient tyranny at all, as they were, in reality, not adopted till after the full development of democracy, and must partly be regarded in a light very different

⁷ This was in some measure the aim of the institutions of Clisthenes in Sicyon, Herod. 5. 68.

⁸ See Thrasybulus the Milesian's advice to Periander, to mow down those who towered above the rest, Herod. 5. 92. 6; Arist. Pol. 5. 8. 7.

⁹ Herod. 3. 39. 123.

from that of mere oppression. Such were the removal of the lower class from the city, as the centre of government, and compelling them to assume the rustic garb of the sheepskin¹⁰. When these measures were intended for the degradation of the *demus*, they appear to be more justly attributable to some of the aristocratic governments¹¹; whenever they were employed by tyrants, they bear indisputable marks of a solicitude for the improvement of agriculture¹², the usual attendants of which are prosperity and tranquillity. Another accusation is, that the tyrants disarmed the people and surrounded themselves with bands of mercenaries. This, which we may certainly assume to have been a general practice, was not, however, done for the mere purpose of having a body-guard, or, as the remark of a later age would lead us to suppose¹³, because the tyrants considered themselves victims marked out for slaughter, but was effected with a view to the greater extension of their authority, as will afterwards be shown. This, again, was not consistent with the policy of entirely disarming their subjects. The Sicilian tyrants, in their contests with the Carthaginians, undoubtedly employed armies composed of their own citizens. The systematic

¹⁰ Moeris, *κατωνάκη*. This is ascribed to the Orthagoridæ, and to Pisistratus by Poll. 7. 68; concerning Pisistratus, Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 1151, sqq.; conf. Suid. *κατωνάκαι*. The *κατωνάκη*, Aristoph. *Eccles.* 724, and *κονιποδες*, 848, do not refer to the ancient time. The history of the word *μόθων* is similar, Hesych. *μόθ*.

¹¹ See § 32. n. 19; conf. Arist. *Pol.* 5. 4. 5; 5. 8. 7; Meier de Bon. *Damn.* 185. n. 81.

¹² Dion. Chrys. 1. 521. At the command of Pisistratus the Athenians became γεωργοὶ καὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν πρότερον ψιλὴν καὶ ἄδενδρον οὖσαν ἐλαίαις κατεφύτευσαν. Gelon incited the people to agriculture as he led them to war, Plut. *Apophth.* 6. 668. Periander went still further; he forbade the use of slaves (?) and compelled the citizens to carry on trade themselves, Nicol. *Damasc.* 42. Orell.; and 450. ed. Vales.

¹³ *Æl.* V. H. 10. 5.

enervation of the people, ascribed to Polycrates¹⁴, and, in order to complete the picture, by Dionysius of Halicarnassus¹⁵, to Aristodemus, may have been practised in a few instances, and in those only with the military nobility. For such a line of conduct would be no less inconsistent with the stimulus given to agriculture, than with the oppression by means of taxation, so frequently alluded to. Hence the means taken to dishearten the people, by imposts and exactions, which Aristotle ascribes to Polycrates¹⁶, cannot be applied to the tyrants generally. The taxes were sometimes light¹⁷, and they must have been sensible that the oppression which aimed at destroying courage was no less calculated to produce despair. There can be little doubt that their position led them to inflict severe punishment on disobedience, and made it their policy to endeavour to rid themselves of dangerous opponents; but in the narratives of Phalaris alone¹⁸ this is exaggerated into inhuman delight at the torments of unhappy victims. Periander, to whom is pre-eminently ascribed the pursuance of a tyrannical and inhuman system¹⁹, originally showed kindly dispositions²⁰; but unpremeditated incest with his mother is said to have inspired him with misan-

¹⁴ Ath. 12. 540; conf. Wytténb. ad Plut. Apophth. 1044, where the real origin of that imputation is shown to be Cyrus' treatment of the Lydians (Herod. 1. 157).

¹⁵ Dionys. 7. 9.

¹⁶ Pol. 5. 9. 4.

¹⁷ Pisistratus subjected arable land to the payment of tithe, Meurs. Pis. 6. 7. 9. The nobility had taken the sixth; Hippias and Hipparchus took a twentieth only, Thucyd. 6. 54; Böckh, Pub. Econ. 1. 351. Gelon conscientiously repaid a loan, Plut. Apophth. 6. 668.

¹⁸ Heracl. Pont. 36. Concerning his bull, see Callimach. Fragm. 1. 487. ed. Ern.; Diod. 13. 90; Cic. in Verr. 4. 33; Ath. 9. 396; Schol. Pind. p. 1. 185. But the bull which Scipio sent back from Carthage to the Agrigentans was an effigy of the river-god Gelas; see the Scholion already referred to.

¹⁹ Arist. Poll. 5. 9. 2; conf. Heracl. Pont. 5; Diog. L. 1. 98.

²⁰ Herod. 5. 92; 6. 7.

thropic cruelty²¹. The employment of spies as a means of security²², naturally attended that of mercenaries, but was not reduced to a definite system till some time afterwards in Syracuse. Finally, we may safely vindicate the tyranny from the charge of having placed its interdict upon mental cultivation²³; this accusation, too, may probably be traced to the conduct pursued by some of the aristocrats towards their dependents, as those of Mitylene, for example²⁴. For how could the courts of the tyrants have been the seats of art and science, had these blossoms of mental culture been prohibited? On the contrary, the care they took to foster and encourage them, the hospitality which the tyrants uniformly showed to artists and poets²⁵, the collection of libraries by Polycrates²⁶ and the Pisistratidæ²⁷, the erection of public edifices, and the adornment of the temples and palace with the productions of art²⁸, bespeak an earnest endeavour to impart external greatness and lustre to the tyranny, and to assimilate it in its outward characteristics to the venerated monarchy of the olden time. Of a corresponding character were the external operations of the state, which required the maintenance

²¹ Parthen. 17; Diog. L. 1. 96. On the other hand, Herodotus' account that the advice of Thrasybulus wrought an entire change in his disposition, appears almost puerile. The anti-tyrannic tendency of the speech of the Corinthian Sosicles, ap. Herod. 5. 92; 2. 3, has likewise cast a false light upon Cypselus.

²² The Bosphoran Leucon said to a slanderer, ἀπέκτεινα ἄν—σέ—εἰ μὴ πονηρῶν ἀνδρῶν ἡ τυραννὶς ἐδεῖτο, Athen. 6. 257. D. This is a truth which is applicable to all ages.

²³ Aristot. Pol. 5. 9. 2. 7.

²⁴ Ælian, V. H. 7. 15; conf. § 26. n. 24.

²⁵ § 50. n. 16. ²⁶ Athen. 1. 3. A.

²⁷ Gell. Noct. Att. 6. 17.

²⁸ See in general Aristot. Pol. 5. 9. 4; concerning Polycrates, Herod. 3. 21. 41; 60. 125; conf. Athen. 12. 540. D. E.; Clisthenes, Paus. 2. 9. 6; Cypselus, Paus. 5. 2. 4; 5. 17, sqq. On the embellishment of Athens by Hipparchus, consult Ps. Plat. Hipparchus, etc.

of a large military force; but this must not be regarded as merely destined for the oppression of the citizens. The general position of the tyrants rendered military exploits necessary, in order to inspire respect for them as martial princes; Hippocrates, Gelon, Theron, Polycrates, Periander, Clisthenes, and Pisistratus, were not deficient in energy and courage; but they were combined with that circumspection which was requisite to the acquisition of external supports to their domination. Every fresh conquest became an additional bulwark to their domestic power²⁹, whilst the peaceful foundation of colonies, as was effected by Cypselus in Ambracia, Anactorium and Leucas³⁰, and alliances with other states, more especially with tyrants, as between Periander and Thrasybulus³¹, Periander and Procles³², and Gelon and Theron³³, were intended to impart firmness to their still wavering authority at home.

IV. DOWNFAL OF THE TYRANNY.

§ 52. Thucydides¹ extols Sparta as the deliverer of the Grecian continent from tyrants; Plutarch² has collected a number of examples in support of his assertion. These are, however, nothing but a mass of doubtful statements injudiciously

²⁹ Montesq. *Espr. d. L.* 8. 16; Quand un prince d'une ville est chassé de sa ville, le procès est fini; s'il a plusieurs villes, le procès n'est que commencé. This is overlooked by Thucydides, 1. 17; against which see his own testimony, 6. 54.

³⁰ Str. 10. 452.

³¹ See. n. 8.

³² § 49. n. 15.

³³ Diod. 11. 26. Analogous cases are when Procles obtained in marriage the daughter of Aristocrates, the Arcadian king, Diog. L. 1. 94, and Clisthenes of Sicyon showed especial favour to Hippocles amongst the suitors for his daughter's hand, because he was related to the Cypselidæ, Herod. 6. 128.

¹ Thucyd. 1. 18; conf. Müll. Dor. 1. 160, sqq., and his *Prolegom.* 405.

² Plut. de Herod. Malig. 9. 411; conf. § 27. n. 17.

compiled in a spirit of opposition to Herodotus; the testimony of Thucydides is only strictly admissible so far as it relates to Athens, but it is of sufficient importance to warrant us in applying it more extensively. In Sparta the tyranny had to encounter serious obstacles, not only in being opposed as a spurious species of government to the legitimate monarchy which still existed there, but also in the alarm caused by the danger to which the ancient Doric institutions in other states became exposed from the innovations of the tyrants, such as the amelioration of the condition of the Pericæci, and the introduction of unconstitutional forms in general. Now, although Sparta's efforts to acquire the hegemony in the Peloponnesus, were naturally accompanied by the selfish desire to rid herself of the enemies of Doric prescription, of which she herself was the nucleus; still the extinction of various tyrannies, for instance, that of Corinth³, occurred before the policy of Sparta had spread over the whole Peloponnesus, and moreover she was by no means the natural enemy of tyranny in general; the Pisistratidæ were on friendly terms with her⁴, and although she afterwards expelled them in obedience to the injunctions of the Delphic god, she was nevertheless subsequently inclined to force Athens once more to submit to their domination⁵; so that we may with Dion. Chrysostomus⁶ look upon the Corinthian Sosicles, who, by his speech⁷, dissolved the confederate army assembled to assist the Pisistratidæ, as the eventual liberator of Athens.

³ According to Euseb. Chron. Ol. 48:

⁵ Herod. 5. 91, sqq.

⁶ Dio Chrysostom, 2. 108. ed. Reisk.

⁴ Herod. 5. 63:

⁷ Herod. 5. 92.

But even assuming that this merit might be attributed to the Spartans, absolutely and without limitation, still the peculiar circumstances by which the subversion of tyranny in the other states was attended, would remain unexplained: wherefore the destruction of that power, like its rise, must be traced to the operation of causes connected with its intrinsic nature, and a corresponding tendency in the spirit of the age.

As the tyranny on the one hand appears as a revival of the kingly office and the conclusion of the ancient time, so it must on the other be regarded as pregnant with the principle of novelty. Innovation and a departure from prescription are implied in the extraordinary intelligence and energy with which the tyrants must have been endowed to attain their station, and the restless ever-active vigilance it required to assert their elevation; they well knew that the age, which continued to advance with them, had higher claims upon them than such as a mere restoration of ancient forms would satisfy, and that although this might serve to give them the sanction of appearances, the effectual supports of their rank and station required to be created anew. Notwithstanding their eminent endowments, and the disposition of the lower orders to honour them like kings of the olden time, their government could not possibly be so firmly rooted as the legitimate monarchy had been⁸. This was eminently displayed in the hereditary transmission of the tyranny. The family principle

⁸ On that account Solon refused the tyranny, ὥσπερ οὐκ ἀρετῇ τοῦ λαβόντος εὐθὺς ἀν βασιλείαν γενομένην, Plut. Sol. 14.

could not have acquired sufficient firmness and consistence in the course of a few generations to support itself by its own inherent strength, wherefore it became indispensable that new and original excellence should characterize the successor of an able tyrant; the want of energy and sagacity was fatal; moral virtue alone could not atone for their absence; although the ancient institutions had been abolished, the decided opponents to their power, the once governing nobles, were by no means extirpated; whilst the *demus*, formerly destitute of all legal and recognized rights, had already gained by the degradation of that once privileged order to a state of equal subjection with itself. At the same time the active and stimulating government of the tyrants had excited fermentation in all the channels of political life; by straining the sinews of the state they had not relaxed, but invigorated them; consciousness and reflection on political systems were roused into activity, one innovation produced another, and even the sight of that success which had crowned the efforts of so many aspirants to the tyranny, was calculated to call up an inclination to emulate their example⁹, or to inspire self-confidence and the consciousness of a capacity to rise in the scale of importance. Hence, in various parts of the Grecian continent, to which the power of Sparta did not extend, the tyranny, which had in some instances been inherited without the sanction of energy and intelligence, a short time before the Persian wars sunk beneath the efforts of numerous assailants; these were exhi-

⁹ Periander says, Herod. 3. 53: *τυραννίς χρηῖμα σφαλὲρόν· πολλοὶ δὲ αὐτῆς ἐρασταί εἰσι.*

bited in various modes¹⁰, but seldom in the simultaneous rise of the people as against Phalaris¹¹, whilst the impulse which was caused by the struggle with the Persians at length spread to Sicily, and eventually effected the deliverance of that country.

The despotic government which afterwards arose served to cast an unfavourable light upon the ancient tyranny, but the demus which had achieved its freedom and possessed numerous memorials of the greatness of those rulers, long continued to recal their merits with affection and gratitude¹²; heroic honours were awarded to Gelon and Theron¹³, and their names, with those of a Cypselus, a Clisthenes, and a Pisistratus, have been handed down to posterity with the glory they deserve. But the pupilage of the demus was now ended, and upon the liberation of Athens, where its career was most triumphant, it was soon destined to show what its emancipated strength could accomplish against the insolence of Persian barbarians and the vengeance of the expelled tyrant Hippias.

¹⁰ Aristot. Poll. 5. 8. 9—11. Concerning the personal motives which influenced the murderers of Hipparchus, see Thucyd. 6. 53, sqq.; Ælian. V. H. 2. 8.

¹¹ Cic. de Offic. 2. 7.

¹² It was not customary "Acta rescindere;" the assertion of Gellius 9. 2, is not consistent with the fact. Corinth, indeed, caused the Delphic treasure of Cypselus to be transferred to the name of the state, Plut. de Pyth. Orac. 7. 576; but the epitaph of Periander was preserved inviolate, Diog. L. 1. 97; and the undertakings commenced by him against other states were partly continued by the commonwealth. But popular hatred is unequivocally expressed in the conduct of the Agrigentans, who forbade their citizens to wear that colour which had once been worn by the body-guards of Phalaris.

¹³ Diodor. 11. 38. 53.

A P P E N D I X.

I.

On the Etesian Winds.

§ 3. n. 20.

THE following collection of the principal statements in the ancient writers concerning the Etesian winds, has been made with the view of imparting some degree of definiteness to this subject, to which such frequent allusion is made; and therefore cannot, from its nature, become the medium of new or original opinions.

Northerly winds prevail during the greater part of the year in the Grecian seas; they begin to blow in the morning, whilst the evenings are generally calm. Clarke, *Travels*, 2. 3. 380. According to Kinsbergen, p. 80, northerly winds prevail at Tenedos for nine months. Hence, the entrance to the Hellespont is rendered so difficult, and the corn-vessels which used to convey supplies from Egypt to the imperial city of Constantinople were frequently obliged to lie so long at anchor; on which account Justinian established magazines on the island of Tenedos, to preserve the corn from the damage to which it became liable on board. Procopius de *Ædific.* 5, 2. The north wind in general (not the Etesiaë), frequently denominated from Thrace (Hesiod. *Op. et Di.* 507, sqq. *Θρηῆσαι πνοαί*, Soph. *Antig.* 585. *Στρυμονίης*, Herod. 8. 118.) was disliked by the Greeks; it is characterized as rough (*δύσπνοοι πνοαί*, Soph. *ubi sup.*)

The Etesiaë form one variety of this class. The word *ἐτησiai*, according to its etymological signification, denotes winds which return annually with a certain regularity. *Βορέαι ἐτήσιοι*, Aristot. *Probl.* 26. 2. In Alexandria the *ἐτησiai ἐκ τῶν βορείων*, Strab. 17. 793, began every year

with the summer. Aquilones Etesiaë, Plin. Hist. Nat. 2. § 42. Etesia flabra aquilonum, Lucret. 5. 741. Comp. 6. 730. So far the word Etesiaë is not used in reference to northerly winds alone. By Posidonius, the *εὔροι* were designated *ἐτησίαι* of the sea extending from Iberia to Sardinia, Str. 3. 144; also the Indian rainy winds by Eratosthenes, Str. 15. 690—692. Compare Arrhian. Anab. 6. 21; Indica 21; Seneca Qu. Nat. 5. 18; Etesiaë—totam Indiam et Æthiopiam continuis aquis irrigant. This serves to explain the statement, Liv. 37. 23, that the fleet of Antiochus had had a slow passage towards the west, along the south coast of Lesser Asia: *adverso tempore Etesiarum, quod velut statum Favoniis esset*. Therefore the word is used without any allusion whatever to a particular point of the compass, Phavorinus ap. Gell. Noct. Att.; Etesiaë et prodromi—certo tempore anni, cum canis oritur, ex alia atque alia cœli parte spirant. Compare Apuleius de Mund. 2. 261: *Sunt Etesiaë et prodromi spirantes ex omni parte eo tempore æstatis, quo canis oritur*.

The word is, in its most limited acceptance, applied to the north-west winds which blew every year about the time of the dog-days in the Grecian seas. To these refers Theophrast. de Vent. etc. (Hanau, 1605. fol.) p. 58; only the north winds are *ἐτησίαι*, not the south winds. These Etesiaë began to blow at the rise of the dog-star, and refreshed Greece during the continuance of the oppressive heats, Pollux, Onom. 1. 61, *θέρος περὶ τὰ Ἐτήσια πνεύματα*. Seneca, Quæst. Natur. 8. 10: *Etesiarum flatus æstatem frangit*. Concerning the heat of this season, see the passages in Kruse, Hellas 249. 250. 262. The power which the Etesiaë exerted over it is attested by the expressive “mythus” of Aristeas, to which we can merely direct the attention of the reader.

The Etesiaë, like northerly winds in general, usually ceased during the night. Theophrast. de Vent. p. 58. Plin. Hist. Nat. 2. 47. Sen. Qu. N. 5. 11: *Atqui Etesiaë ob hoc somniculosi a nautis et delicati vocantur, quod—mane nesciunt surgere*.

They are accurately described as north-west winds by

Aristotle, de Mund. 4: *Οἱ ἐτησίαι λεγόμενοι μίξιν ἔχοντες τῶν τε ἀπὸ τῆς ἄρκτου φερομένων καὶ ζεφύρων.* Comp. Aristot. Meteorol. 2. 6, where several winds from the same point of the compass are spoken of. Diodor. 1. 39: *Οὐ βορέαι γὰρ οὐδ' ἀπαρκταί μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πνέοντες ἀπὸ θερινῆς δύσεως ἀργέσται κοινωνοῦσι τῆς τῶν ἐτησίων προσηγορίας.* Therefore in Hesych. *Ἀργέσται—οἱ ἐτήσιοι.* Comp. Suid. *Ἐτησίαι.*

According to Theophrast. de Vent. p. 62, there blew in several regions, during the Etesiaë, a sort of counterwinds; as, for instance, the *Παλιμβορέας* of the Euripus. Their strength was not everywhere equal. In Thessaly they were moderate, Theoph. ub. sup. p. 63; on the islands violent, still more so by Carystus; Ibid. p. 70: *μᾶλλον ἰσχύουσι καὶ σύντονοτέρως τοῖς βορείοις.* On the north coast of Egypt their strength was very great; hence the assertion, that the inundations of the Nile arose in consequence of their impeding the course of the river; Herod. 2. 20. Comp. Diod. ubi sup.; Ammian. Marc. 22. 35. Therefore Cæsar was compelled by the Etesiaë to remain in Egypt, qui Alexandria navigantibus sunt adversissimi venti. They rendered the passage from Rhodes to Athens almost impracticable during the dog-days. Cicero ad Att. 6. 7. (The brother of Sir Sydney Smith spent nearly a month on the passage from Rhodes to Cos. Clarke's Trav. 2. 2. 380.)

The following examples may serve to prove the influence they exercised on navigation and political warfare. The oldest on record is probably the mention of a drifting from Cape Malea towards Crete, in three different parts of the Odyssey, viz., 3. 289, sqq.; 4. 514, sqq.; 9. 80, sqq.—Miltiades sailed with the Etesiaë from Eleus to Lemnos, Herod. 6. 140.—After the battle of Salamis, the Corcyreans who had remained behind to reconnoitre, alleged as a pretext that they had been prevented by the Etesian winds from doubling Cape Malea, Herod. 7. 168. This is not to be interpreted of the easterly course, but of the northerly direction, in which it was afterwards necessary to steer. On the subject of the passage from

the Pontus into the Hellespont with the assistance of the Etesiaë, see Polyb. 4. 44; 6. 10. Most important was their influence on the naval operations of Philip of Macedon and the Athenians. They impeded the progress of the Athenians towards the north (Demosth. Philipp. 1. 48. 93. ed. Reisk.); but Philip availed himself of them for the objects of his expedition (Argum. Demosth. Phil. 1. 39). They were no less influential in the Ionian sea. When they blew, the passage from Cephallenia to Messenia could be performed in one day; Polyb. 5. 5. They facilitated the voyage from Italy to Greece (Cicer. ad Famil. 12. 22), and to the east (Tacit. Hist. 2. 98). On the other hand, they greatly protracted Dion's passage from Zacynthus to Sicily. Plut. Dion 24.

II.

The Passes of the Cithæron.

§ 6. n. 37.

Towards the south, Bœotia is so shut in by the Cithæron and Parnes, that eastward and westward of these mountains it is only close to the sea that there is space enough left for roads; in the former direction there was a convenient one from Attica to Oropus, in the latter a very arduous one, (ὄρεινή, Xen. Hell. 6. 4. 3; χαλεπή, Ibid. 6. 4. 25. Conf. 5. 4. 16—18, and the statements in Müll. Orch. 492. 493.), along the brink of the Alcyonian sea from the Megarian Pagæ towards Creusis. But the great thoroughfare between Bœotia and the Peloponnesus led over the Cithæron. Allusions to them in ancient authors are sufficiently numerous; nevertheless it is still a matter of doubt whether there was one military road (λεωφόρος) or two. But this must, in consequence of the changes which the aspect of the country has undergone, be chiefly deduced from an attentive examination of the accounts of the ancients. Xenophon makes mention of one pass of the Cithæron; however, in consequence of a supposition that every one was necessarily acquainted

with its peculiar character, he treats the subject with extreme brevity; *Hell.* 5. 4. 47: τὸ ὑπὲρ τῆς κατὰ τὸν *Κιθαιρῶνα* ὁδοῦ ἄκρον; comp. 5. 4. 59, and καταλαβεῖν τὸν *Κιθαιρῶνα*, 5. 4. 37, and διὰ τοῦ *Κιθαιρῶνος*, 5. 4. 59. Now it is certain that both on the northern and southern sides of the *Cithæron* there were two roads to its summit and over it; on the northern side, the one leading from *Platææ*, the other from *Thebes*, by the hamlets *Erythræ* and *Hysiæ*—*Thuc.* 3. 24: οἱ *Πλαταιῆς*—ἐχώρουν—τὴν ἐς *Θήβας* φέρουσαν ὁδόν· καὶ ἅμα ἐώρων τοὺς *Πελοποννησίους* τὴν πρὸς *Κιθαιρῶνα* καὶ *Δρυὸς κεφαλὰς*, τὴν ἐπ’ *Ἀθηνῶν* φέρουσαν μετὰ *Λαμπάδων* διώκοντας· καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν ἕξ ἢ ἑπτὰ σταδίους οἱ *Πλαταιῆς* τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν *Θηβῶν* ἐχώρησαν, ἐπειθ’ ὑποστρέψαντες ἦσαν τὴν πρὸς τὸ ὄρος φέρουσαν ὁδόν, ἐς *Ερύθρας* καὶ *Ῥσίας*, καὶ λαβόμενοι τῶν ὁρῶν διαφεύγουσιν ἐς τὰς *Ἀθήνας*. Comp. *Pausan.* 9. 1. 3: *Νεοκλῆς*—*Βοιωταρχῶν*—(τοὺς *Θηβαίους*) οὐ τὴν εὐθείαν ἀπὸ τῶν *Θηβῶν* τὴν τε ἐπὶ τὴν *πεδιάδα*, τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ *Ῥσιῶν* ἦγε πρὸς *Ἐλευθερῶν* τε καὶ τῆς *Ἀττικῆς*. Two ways up the south side are described by *Xenoph.* *Hell.* 5. 4. 14: καὶ τὴν μὲν δι’ *Ἐλευθερῶν* ὁδὸν *Χαβρίας*, ἔχων *Ἀθηναίων* *πελταστὰς* ἐφύλαττεν· ὁ δὲ *Κλεόμβροτος* ἀνέβαινε κατὰ τὴν ἐς *Πλαταιὰς* φέρουσαν· *προϊόντες* δὲ οἱ *πελτασταὶ* (*viz.*, of *Cleombrotus*) *περιτυγχάνουσιν* ἐπὶ τῷ ἄκρῳ *φυλάττουσι* τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου *λελυμένοις* (*i. e.* *Θηβαίοις*)—καὶ τούτους μὲν ἅπαντας—ἀπέκτειναν· αὐτὸς δὲ κατέβαινε πρὸς τὰς *Πλαταιὰς*. From this it appears, especially from the passage of *Xenophon*, 5. 4. 14, and of *Thuc.* 3. 24, that there were two passes on the heights of the *Cithæron*, the one from *Eleutheræ* to *Hysiæ* and *Erythræ*, the other from *Megaris* to *Platææ*. To the latter, however, appertains the name *Δρυὸς κεφαλὰς*; *Herod.* 9. 39:—ἐς τὰς ἐσβολὰς τὰς *Κιθαιρωνίδας*, αἱ ἐπὶ *Πλαταιέων* φέρουσι· τὰς *Βοιωτοὶ* μὲν *τρεις* κεφαλὰς καλέουσι, *Ἀθηναῖοι* δὲ *Δρυὸς κεφαλὰς*. Comp. the above-quoted passage of *Thucydides*. This pass not only seems to have been the more convenient one, but likewise the more agreeable to the *Peloponnesians*, as

they could reach it from Megaris, without touching on the territory of the Athenians; and this is understood in those passages which do not contain a more special local description—for instance, in those of Xenophon cited above. In after-times its superior practicability became so generally acknowledged, that the other pass was scarcely ever traversed, and passengers generally took the road from Eleutheræ to Plataæ. Thus Pausanias, 9. 2. 2: λεωφόρος ἀπ' Ἐλευθερῶν ἐς Πλαταιὰν ἄγει; and Strab. 9. 411:—τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν εἰς Ἀθήνας καὶ Μέγαρά ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρων τῶν τῆς Ἀττικῆς καὶ τῆς Μεγαρίδος. This road, finally, is the one in use at the present day.

III.

Geraneia and Oneion.

§ 6. n. 42. 44.

The mountain Geraneia (ἡ Γεράνεια; in Diodor, 19. 54, Γερανία,)—there can be no doubt—lay to the north-east of the isthmus in Megaris. Thuc. 1. 105. Compare 1. 108; 4. 70. Pausan. 1. 40. 1. Steph. Byzan. Γεράνεια. That side of it which declined towards the Saronic gulf was exceedingly steep; there were the Scironian rocks (comp. an epigram attributed to Simonides in Brunck's *Analect.* 1. p. 143); to the west it stretched as far as the gulf of Corinth, wherefore Pagæ situate there was of importance as a place of thoroughfare. There was likewise a rarely-trodden road at the back of the mountain—δύσσοδος—ἡ Γεράνεια, Thucyd. 1. 107. Conf. 108, and Diodorus 11. 80.

Entirely distinct from this is the range of mountains called Oneion (τὸ Ὀνειον, Xenoph. *Hell.* 6. 5. 51. Ὀνεα ὄρη, Polyb. 2. 52. Ὀνεα ὄρη, Strab. 8. 380.) This is almost universally described by the moderns as a part of the Geraneia, or as very nearly connected with it, and placed northward of the isthmus. This does not appear to me to be correct. Strabo seems to be the authority adduced in support of the statement; he says, 8. 380: τὰ

καλούμενα "Ονεια ὄρη, διατείνοντα μέχρι Βοιωτίας καὶ Κιθαιρώνος ἀπὸ τῶν Σκειρωνίδων πετρῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς παρὰ ταύτας ὁδοῦ πρὸς τὴν Ἀττικὴν. Comp. 9. 393, and the passage in Vatic. Append. 3. 71, which is nearly to the same effect. But this—supposing these local appellations to have undergone no change in Strabo's time—appears to involve a confusion with the Geraneia, and it results from the testimony of older writers, that the Oneion lay to the south of the isthmus. In corroboration of this, we might especially refer to Thucydides' description of the battle between the Athenians and Corinthians near the hill Solygius, 4. 42—44. This lay along a creek twenty stadia south of the isthmus, between the two Cenchreæ. During the battle a detachment of Corinthians was unemployed in Cenchreæ—τούτοις οὐ κατά-δηλος ἡ μάχη ἦν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ Ὀνείου. Hence it would appear that the Oneion was situated between Cenchreæ and the Solygius. But this must not be conceived as a single mountain, but as a series of heights, which rendered the entrance to the Peloponnesus extremely difficult, and across which there were several passages—Xenoph. Hell. 7. 1. 15.—ἐφύλαττον ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν τοῦ Ὀνείου, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ καὶ Πελληνεῖς κατὰ τὸ ἐπιμαχώτατον. The most practicable was by Cenchreæ, Xen. Hell. 6. 5. 51: τὴν καλλίστην παρὰ Κεγχρέας πάροδον. Comp. 7. 1. 41:—τὸν ὑπὲρ Κεγχρεῶν λόφον. On the subject of Epaminondas' passage across it, compare Polyæn. 2. 3. 3; 2. 3. 9. Between the Oneion and the Geraneia lay the valley of the isthmus (see Gell. ap. Popp. Thucyd. 2. 232. note). Here Chabrias threw up a trench, Olymp. 102. 4, from Cenchreæ to Lechæum, in order to prevent Epaminondas from entering the Peloponnesus, Diodor. 15. 68. Again, upon the approach of Antigonus, Cleomenes fortified the space between Acrocorinthus and the Oneion to guard the Peloponnesus, Polyb. 2. 52, but thereupon fell back upon the Oneion himself, Plut. Cleom. 20.

IV.

The Sources from which our Knowledge of the Heroic Age is derived.

§ 9. n. 1.

The Grecian historian possessed no older or richer store of materials for the primitive ages of his own nation, than was contained in the Homeric poems; and although it might occasionally have been asked whether certain historical and geographical notices might with safety be borrowed from them, still criticism was very far removed from the annihilating attitude it has assumed at the present day, which compels every one, who wishes to adduce Homer as an historical authority, to support a contest for him and for the validity of his testimony, without which quotations from the Homeric poems run the risk of being considered wholly inadmissible.

Whether these poems had one composer or several is by no means an indispensable preliminary enquiry; it is sufficient that they reveal a peculiar and exclusive spirit, which, if it does not belong to a single individual, at least is the property of a moral person, a particular age, and as such constitutes admissible evidence for a political state of things, to which, and not to events, our expositions are more especially directed; considered in this point of view, their testimony is perhaps more valuable than that of a single individual. For the sake of brevity, however, we shall still continue to employ the ancient name of Homer.

In this consideration it is necessary to adopt one of two hypotheses: 1. Homer either adapted his poetry to something which existed before and with him, consequently either gave a faithful transmission of the legend, or represented his own time; or, 2. Homer created original poetry, without any archetype in reality whatever. The scepticism of antiquity was almost exclusively directed to the events commemorated by Homer and his geographical statements. The ancients are tacitly agreed as to the credibility and historical accuracy of his delineations of the moral and

political phenomena of his time: on this head there existed no doubt. The principal sceptics of the former kind were Herodotus¹, most characteristically called by Fr. v. Schlegel the first *Chorizon*, whose incredulity, with regard to Helen's abode in Troy, had been caused by Egyptian legends; Eratosthenes and Apollodorus on the subject of geographical data, the former even to raillery²; Dion Chrysostomus on the destruction of Troy. Thucydides, in the consciousness of that greatness which was the attribute of the Athenian age, beheld in the early times nothing but the humble infancy of things, but he does not question the accuracy of the political picture or the heroic way of thinking; Ephorus, by beginning his histories with the Heraclid-Doric migration, seems to have pronounced all that lay beyond it fabulous matter, but it was very far from his intention to supply grounds for the conclusion that the matter in question was wholly destitute of an historical character, from the circumstance of its being unfitted for the range of his historical investigations; on the contrary, he is not unfrequently more entangled in the legendary cycle of the heroic age, than historical criticism is disposed to allow. Polybius, where judgment was wholly free from the influence of Grecian prejudices, expresses himself, with particular reference to the geographical statements, to the effect that Homer, notwithstanding he made use of the license of a poet, still took facts for a basis³.

The ancients attempt for the most part to meet the enquiry whether Homer represents what existed in his age, by an examination of insulated statements; for instance, when Ephorus in Strabo⁴, in no very critical

¹ Herod. 2. 120.

² —φησὶ, τότε ἂν εὐρεῖν τινα, ποῦ Ὀδυσσεὺς πεπλάνηται, ὅταν εὖρη τὸν σκυρία τὸν συρράψαντα τὸν τῶν ἀνέμων ἀσκόν. Strab. 1. 24; and concerning Apollodorus, *ibid.* 7. 298.

³ —ἐκ μηδενὸς ἀληθοῦς ἀνάπτειν καινὴν τερατολογίαν οὐχ Ὀμηρικόν· προσπίπτει γάρ, ὡς εἰκὸς, ὡς πιθανώτερον, ἂν οὕτω τις ψεύδοιτο, εἰ καταμίσγοι τι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀληθινῶν. Strab. 1. 20. Compare his Judgment, 1. 25: Εἰ δὲ τινα μὴ συμφωνεῖ, μεταβολὰς αἰτιᾶσθαι δεῖ, ἢ ἀγνοίαν, ἢ καὶ ποιητικὴν ἔχουσίαν, ἢ συνέστηκεν ἐξ ἱστορίας, καὶ διαθέσεως, καὶ μύθου.—Τὸ δὲ πάντα πλάττειν, οὐ πιθανόν, οὐδ' Ὀμηρικόν, and see, on this subject, Fr. v. Schlegel, *Gesch. d. ep. Poes. Schr.* 3. 90.

⁴ Strab. 10. 479.

spirit observes, that Homer places a hundred cities in Crete, whereas there were only ninety in the heroic age; more pertinently Velleius Paterculus remarks⁵, that Homer mentions Corinth, which did not yet exist under that name. But on the other hand it is most justly affirmed by the pseudo-Herodotus, in the life of Homer⁶, that the latter was compelled, by esthetical necessity, to embody in his poetry either that which was most beautiful in itself, or what was peculiar to his own country. Let us for a moment suppose that the political descriptions and opinions of Homer had been borrowed from foreign models: nothing but an equal violation of reason and nature could have represented what was actually existing in other countries, as the native institutions of by-gone ages; jest, satire, and allegory were equally foreign from his intention. It is even doubtful whether Homer was so accurately acquainted with the political system of any other country, as to be capable of calling up a distinct poetical image of it. It must have been as remote from his design, as it would have been absurd in itself, to describe, in a popular poem, which was destined to perpetuate the life and actions of the fathers in the remembrance of the sons, ideal constitutions and purely fictitious manners and customs, works of art, etc., in lieu of the usages and objects of their own country. He must have been devoid of all inclination to such a course; for the national poet, who arises during the youth of a nation, is generally identified with, and held in subjection by the present; he cannot disengage himself from it, and in him natural feeling is the apprehension of a poetical truth, which appears as such to his people in the same manner as to himself. This may be asserted of the ancient Greek poet with more especial truth, as it was ever a prominent feature in the disposition of his nation to adapt the ethical side of life in all its bearings to its own peculiar character,

⁵ Vell. Patere. l. 3, ex persona poetæ.

⁶ Ep. 37 :—*ἀνδρα ποιητὴν τηλικούτον εἰκός ἐστι τῶν νομίμων τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ποιῶντα εἰς τὴν ποίησιν, ἥτοι τὰ κάλλιστα ἐξευρόντα ποιεῖν, ἢ τὰ ἐωυτοῦ πάτρια ἔόντα.*

and to reconcile and bring it into harmony with it. Thus the gods were in the heroic age drawn after the models of the illustrious Greeks⁷; hence Homer is acquainted with the wonders and monsters of other regions, but not with foreign political institutions and manners. It is in the physical world only that poetry sports uncontrolled with all sorts of airy images; the moral picture has only gradations, not *essentially different* or *foreign* colours. This is, at the same time, a pledge to us of the willingness of Homer to reproduce in a faithful transcript, those manners, customs, and feelings with which he was acquainted, but at the same time, according to the poet's right, in hues more bright and vivid. Finally, it is by no means difficult to strip of its poetical garb the description of moral and political life. The attachment to the real world there involuntarily discovers itself in the feeling, which does not disdain to exhibit, in the same picture, the splendour of silver and gold and the farm-yard of Ulysses. In this respect Thucydides⁸, even in his time, judged sagaciously and correctly, as did Strabo, who, upon other occasions, is by no means free from prejudice⁹.

Hence, we have to show that Homer neither invented nor borrowed the moral features of his national picture from foreign sources, but that he either derived them from the native traditions or was a witness of them himself.

In considering the latter view of the subject, it may be asked, was not Homer's age entirely different from the preceding one; and does not the act of transferring its peculiarities to the heroic age involve mere fiction and an ignorance of its real nature? We answer, no—affirm that there was an essential connection between the two, and do not recognise a gulf between them, a total revolution in feelings and manners. The whole ethico-political world around Homer struck deep roots into the ancient time, and was in various ways connected with it. Thus

⁷ Aristot. Poll. 1. 1. 7.

⁸ Thuc. 1. 10: εἰκὸς ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον μὲν ποιητὴν ὄντα κοσμήσαι.

⁹ Strab. 1. 20: ὥς ὃ ὅτε τις χρυσὸν περιχεύεται ἀργύρῳ ἀνὴρ, κ. τ. λ.

Homer, in regard of the ethical impress of himself and his time, must be imagined as still within the larger boundaries of the heroic age. It is here immaterial that he employs, for many of the political objects of that period, names which were only called into being by the revolutions consequent upon the migrations; for instance, when he mentions Sparta, although Amyclæ was apparently the ancient Achæan seat of government, and records a Thessalus (Il. 2. 682), etc. Herein the present took precedence of the past, and it is unnecessary to enter into a criticism of detached verses, although there may be ample opportunities for such a course. How many of the *forms* of the olden time still existed in unimpaired vigour, or stood as the memorials of a former age, it is unnecessary to enquire. The continuance of a mode of feeling may depend upon very slight circumstances, and still preserve an affinity in the children of different centuries, even though this should be a mere yearning in the descendants after the customs and manners of their fathers. This is especially the case in the youth of nations, change not then exerting its force in such a degree as afterwards, when the various blossoms of human culture are unfolded, the national manners, estranged from their natural simplicity, traverse the most opposite paths in rapid succession, and the sons are sometimes unable to comprehend the age of their fathers.

Homer, indeed, calls the heroes different from the men of his time¹⁰, and characterizes the latter as an inferior race of beings¹¹. But what does he ascribe to the heroes, but greater physical strength? And what does his idea of a more perfect past in point of fact prove? It is a notion which he shares with the whole human race, and is displayed as such, when the heroes themselves, in their turn, extol the age of their fathers¹². On the other hand, the Homeric poesy does not represent a difference

¹⁰ Οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἶσι.

¹¹ Il. 2. 110; 5. 747; 19. 41. No weight can be laid upon the suspicious ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, Il. 12. 23.

¹² Nestor. Il. 1. 260, sqq.

in the political life of the heroic age, from that of the actual time, or even a still more exalted state of political development, such as might be found in the genealogies of Hesiod (Op. et. Dies. 108, sqq.) The Homeric Cyclops¹³ are an emblem of the family system not yet expanded into the state; the political chronicle only ascends at the farthest to Troas, where Dardanus founds Ilium and the state together¹⁴; Homer is unacquainted with any thing anterior.

Again, if it should be proposed to reject Homer's picture of the heroic age, which he apparently does not describe as different from his own, so that in lieu of the actions of the mythical time, which cannot all be denied, some other political and ethical condition should be assumed, of what nature could this have been conformably to the analogy of history? A Pelasgic peaceful period? and yet a Theban and a Trojan war? A theocracy? and still Pelopidæ and Æacidæ? a wild and uncivilized state of things without elevation of sentiment? Any substitute of this description would be lamentably inadequate, and only serve to prove the more clearly, that the feelings and manners of the heroic system extend back from the period of their commemoration in Homer, in one genetic series to the time of their actual existence, and that the poet was capable of drawing a faithful picture of them from the stores of his own mind.

However, that notion which makes the heroic system begin with the poesy of Homer, and till then establishes a vacuum, is supported by a much-controverted assertion of Herodotus, that Homer and Hesiod had created the Grecian theogony¹⁵. What can be more closely connected with the Homeric heroes than the Homeric gods? The word *ποιέειν* may indeed be interpreted with reference to the poetical adornment of Olympus; but Herodotus is seriously and strictly of opinion, that the knowledge of the descent, nature, etc., of the gods, was still

¹³ Odyss. 9. 112, sqq.

¹⁴ Il. 20. 215, sqq.

¹⁵ Hesiod. 2. 53: οὗτοι δὲ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην "Ελληνσι, κ. τ. λ.

young¹⁶. But this abridgment of the beginnings of heroic antiquity is not, as in Thucydides, the offspring of the sober understanding, and a disinclination to deal with poetical illusions in which individual details, whether true or false, cannot be distinctly perceived and apprehended, but rather that Egyptian prejudice, with which, almost like the priest when conversing with Solon¹⁷, he contrasts the remote antiquity of Egypt with the infancy of Greece. Those who can assent to his doctrine, open to themselves an ample field for the interpretation of poetical theology, in which, perhaps, like the strangely ingenious Vico, they may succeed in discovering allegorical representations of political objects¹⁸. Still, notwithstanding all these attempts at profound and mystical interpretation, it remains certain that Homer represents the life of the gods and the political order in Olympus anthropomorphically, (Zeus in Olympus being a reflex of the heroic monarchy on earth,) whilst, according to Herodotus, the picture of earthly affairs could not possibly go forth from the poetic laboratory so bright and original as that of the divine race, which very argument proves Herodotus' opinion of the theogony to be untenable.

The connection between the heroic-Homeric age and the succeeding one in institutions and character was, it must be confessed, at one time considered in such a light, that it was attempted to deduce from what existed subsequently, historical confirmation of the justness of the Homeric delineations: this is no longer the case. One ingenious view

¹⁶ *Of πρώην τε καὶ χθὲς*, ib. Analogous to this is 8. 137, *ἔσαν γὰρ τοπάλαι καὶ αἱ τυραννίδες τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθενεῖς χρήμασι, οὐ μόνον ὁ δῆμος· ἡ δὲ γόνυ τοῦ βασιλῆος αὐτῇ τὰ σιτία σφι ἔπεσσε*.

¹⁷ *ὦ Σόλων, Σόλων, Ἕλληνες αἰεὶ παῖδες ἔστε, γέρον δὲ Ἕλληνα οὐκ ἔστιν*. Platon. Tim. 22 B.

¹⁸ I have only had access to Weber's translation of the *Principi di Scienza Nuova*, p. 358. Jupiter is the idea of religion; Juno and Diana signify marriage; Apollo the god of civil splendour, of nobility; Venus, civil beauty; Minerva and Mercury signify the *lex agraria*; p. 441. 458. Plebeians are represented by Tantalus and Mars, the latter of whom is wounded by Minerva (the armed aristocratic orders); Vulcan, who is hurled down from heaven. Comp. p. 269. The heroes are beautiful, whereas Æsop and Thersites, as plebeians, are ugly. Irus, in the *Odyssey*, is the type of an agrarian contest. The views of his successor, Pagano, are, it must be confessed, developed in a very different manner.

of the subject¹⁹ attempts to establish a connection between the Homeric and the heroic ages indeed, but separates both from the succeeding one. Moreover, it regards the subsequent age as entirely new, and as a consequence of the migration of the Heraclidæ, and the events by which it was followed, thus severing the lineal tie which connects it with the time of the heroes. Now if this should be imagined as an earlier order of things within the limits of Hellenic nationality, such a view of the subject might be compared to the ancient Grecian opinion, which represented the rise of political society as occurring after a destruction through inundation, or some other calamity²⁰. But that opinion rather makes Homer and the heroic age co-existent with, than anterior to the commencement of the historical age of the Greeks; that is to say, places him in Troas at the court of the still remaining Dardanidæ in Gergis. But, on the other hand, it ascribes works of remote antiquity in the heart of Greece, the Cyclopean walls, etc., to the age after the migration of the Heraclidæ. The first hypothesis assumes that the Homeric dialect arose from the mixture of language during the ten years war, but was afterwards adopted by the Ionians, together with the poetry, by which means Homer became naturalized. But how, I again ask, are we to fill up that void which is created beyond the migration of the Heraclidæ by the total annihilation of Grecian feelings and actions? Nay, still more, whence are we to derive compensation for the original poetical excellence of which we strip the Greeks immediately after the migration? From Gergis? The path is not inviting; we dare not contemplate the void, which is asserted to have existed during this period in Greece, and rise up in defence of her rightful claims.

Now, although it is not very difficult to prove that various institutions of subsequent polity were promulgated

¹⁹ Schubarth, *Ideas on Homer and his Age*, 1821, and the announcement of the book in the *Jena. L. Z.* 1823, September.

²⁰ Aristot. *Poll.* 2. 5. 12; *Plat. Tim.* 22, C. D.; *Politic.* 270, C.; de Legg. 3. 677, A.

with the stamp of heroic antiquity, as, for example, under the kingship of Sparta, still the space between the fall of Troy and the Homeric poesy is too considerable, for the commemoration of many of the forms of the heroic age not to have been entirely left to tradition. But the province of tradition is not so much the commemoration of a state of things and manners, as a recital of events and actions; it can only seize and reproduce the spirit of the primitive time in the antique character of its style. Therefore, descriptions of objects of this kind, which were no longer in actual being, might be looked upon as the subjective creations of the poet's mind; but this could only be imagined in the closest communion and interaction with the general spirit of the contemporary age, and its fund of legendary lore.

It remains to be asked, whether Homer is to be looked upon as the only source of our information concerning the heroic age? There can be no doubt, that manifold legends were propagated at the same time with the Homeric poems, and that the remembrance of the ancient times was conducted through various channels to younger generations. To these must be referred those traditions, of which no traces are to be discovered in Homer. Even the ancients declared, that his silence ought not to be adduced without limitation, as an evidence of the non-existence of a thing²¹. Does it follow that Cyclopean walls were not constructed till after Homer's time, from the fact of his not having mentioned them? It would require many pages to enumerate all the instances in which, and all the reasons why, he was silent, and to exhibit the *argumentum a silentio* in its real insignificance²².

In the poems of Hesiod, whose name, like that of Homer, must be regarded as the representative of an age,

²¹ —ἀπλῶς δὲ τὸ μὴ λέγειν οὐ τοῦ μὴ εἶδέναι σημεῖον ἐστίν. Strab. 1. 36; comp. 1. 32; 8. 341; 12. 553.

²² Mille preuves de ce genre ne peuvent en former une positive; on ne sauroit, trop le répéter.—L'abus des preuves négatives a enfanté tous ces systèmes, dont nous sommes depuis si longtems inondés, etc. Sainte-Croix Des Anc. Gouvern. Fédératifs, p. 320.

and in those of the Cyclic poets, we likewise behold ancient tradition and modern fiction flowing side by side; the latter is eminently conspicuous in the *Ποιαι* of Hesiod; but the more marked the difference between the institutions of the past and present became, the purer was the gratification derived from the poetical description of the ancient greatness. But henceforward there were two sources of adulteration: first, the infancy of modern institutions was removed back into the historical times, in order thereby to render them more venerable, as the patricians in Rome afterwards sought to derive lustre from the glory of their ancestors in the regal age, and in Sparta various institutions obtained greater sanction from being denominated Lycurgan; and secondly, it became necessary to assimilate the discipline of that which had existed in the heroic age to subsequent phenomena, whose origin was falsely referred to that age: this is perceptible in the monarchy of the Attic tragedy, and the asserted foundation of the Athenian democracy by Theseus²³. Even Aristotle himself²⁴, although probably only merely in order to exemplify an analogy, pretends to discover the infancy of ostracism amongst the Argonauts, who leave Hercules behind.

Hence, in availing ourselves of all the sources presented to us, we must be especially careful to discriminate between those opinions which were foreign to the heroic times, and the facts they accompany. Now as Homer will be our principal authority, and his age expresses itself in him, the peculiar opinion of the poet and the political maxim—the expression of the national mind, cannot be so entirely separated, as in the case of the writer or individual statesman, and the collective nation of succeeding ages; nevertheless, even in Homer, it is by no means difficult to distinguish between what was considered as a gnome in itself, and the original and dramatic portraiture of character, for instance, that of an heroic Agamemnon and a quarrelsome Thersites.

²³ Hence, no importance can be attached to testimonies from Æschylus and Euripides, and the appeals of the orators to the constitution of Theseus.

²⁴ Polit. 3. 9.

V.

The Tyrrhenian Pelasgians.

§ 9. n. 21.

A few additional observations respecting the confusion between the Pelasgic Tyrrhenians and the Etruscans or Italian Tyrrhenians may not be out of place here. The Tyrrhenians belonging to the Grecian mother-country were the builders of the Pelasgic citadel in Athens alone, who, when driven from thence, passed over into Lemnos, Imbrus, and (Müll. Orchom. Append. 4. 438.) Scyros, and afterwards into Thrace. Herod. 1. 57; Thuc. 4. 109. When Herodotus separates the Pelasgians from the Tyrrhenians — Πελασγῶν, τῶν ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν Κρηστώνων πόλιν οἰκεόντων, 1. 57.—he betrays an imperfect acquaintance with the subject. Thucydides ubi sup. very explicitly calls the Tyrrhenians a Pelasgic tribe, and, on the contrary, mentions the Crestoniats as a distinct race residing near them (Herodotus, Pelasgians) (τὸ δὲ πλεῖστον Πελασγικὸν, τῶν καὶ Δῆμνόν ποτε καὶ Ἀθήνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων, καὶ Βισαλτικόν, καὶ Κρηστωνικόν, κ. τ. λ.); he undoubtedly knew that country better than Herodotus. The etymologist may very well consider τύρρις, a tower, fortress, (τύρσος, τὸ ἐν ὕψει ὠκοδομημένον, Suidas; compare Orph. Argon. 151. τύρσιν ἐρυμνῆς Μιλήτοιο, Pind. Ol. 2. 127, Κρόνου τύρσιν) to be the root of the name Tyrrhenian, (Dionys. Hal. Arch. 1. 26:—τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν — ταύτην ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρυμάτων, ἃ πρῶτοι—κατεσκευάσαντο — τύρσεις γὰρ καὶ παρὰ Τυρρῆνοῖς αἱ ἐντείχιοι καὶ στεγαναὶ οἰκῆσεις, κ. τ. λ. He adduces the Mosynæci by way of analogy), then immediately traces the etymology of τύραννος, the lord of the tower or citadel, and connects this with the Etruscan *Lar*, Lord, and *Larissa*. Philochorus and others, with less attention to the simple root, considered Τυρρῆνὸς the primitive of Τύραννος. Thus the former, Schol. Luc. Catap. (Siebel. p. 13): Τύραννος εἶρηται ἀπὸ τῶν Τυρρῆνῶν τῶν βιαίων καὶ ληστῶν ἐξ

ἀρχῆς, κ. τ. λ. Hence it is easy to explain the frequent confusion of those two words, as well as of their derivatives τυραννικὸς and τυρρηνικὸς in the lexicographers; as in Phot. πελαργικὸν τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν τυράννων κατασκευασθὲν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τεῖχος; Etym. M. Σιντιίδα, of Lemnos, the Σίντιες, ἔθνος τυραννικὸν καὶ ληστρικόν, there, etc. Comp. above § 50. n. 24. Sophocles in Inachus

Ἰναχε γεννᾶτορ—

..... μέγα πρεσβεύων

.....

καὶ Τυρρηνόισι Πελασγοῖς.

Dionys. Hal. Arch. 1. 25, and others, transferred the denomination Τυρρῆνηοὶ Πελασγοὶ to the Pelasgians in Argolis. The confusion of these Tyrrhenians in Hellas with the Italian Rasena (Dionys. Hal. Arch. 1. 30.) probably arose not only from the similarity of termination, but likewise from the erection of citadels by the latter, which occasioned a name that was in point of fact peculiar to Greece, to be applied to them. The oldest mention which occurs of the western Tyrrhenians is wholly unmixed with any unfavourable judgment on their national character. The Tyrrhenians in Hesiod. Theogo. 1015, the subject of Latinus (πᾶσιν Τυρσηνοῖσιν ἀγακλειτοῖσιν ἄνασσε), appear to have been a nation but little known, and dwelling on remote coasts—μάλα τῇλε μυχῶ νησῶν ἰεράων—, but of unblemished reputation. Afterwards Tyrrhenians appear in the character of pirates (Hom. Hymn. Bacch. Mnaseus Amazonis Athen. 7. 296, D. Argonaut. Apollod. 1. 9. 18). This and the Tyrrhenian empire of the sea, in Euseb. Chron. 927, may have been chiefly borrowed from their pursuits; the influence of the accounts from the Italian Cuma must likewise be taken into account here. At the same time the ancient Pelasgic Tyrrhenians on Lemnos, etc., were looked upon as a sort of outlaws from Grecian political society, and doubtless addicted to piracy. Thus two causes henceforward conspired to promote the gradual traducement of the Tyrrhenian character, their twofold extraction and

home being no longer specified. In Hygin. Fab. 274, Tyrrhenus is the son of Hercules, and his companions eat human flesh.

VI.

On the names Hellas, Hellenes, Helli, Selli, Græci.

§ 12. n. 17.

If we take the local denomination Hellas for the root, and the national name Hellenes for the derivative (parum grammaticæ, Heyne ad Hom. vol. 4. p. 395), we are led to think of a tract of country reclaimed from a marsh (ἔλος), and may bring forward, in support of this derivation, the Laconian Helos (see above § 7. n. 36.), and Apollod. 2. 4. 6, ἐκ δὲ Ἑλούς τῆς Ἀργείας, Strab. 9. 404.—ὁ Ἑλεών —, κώμη Ταναγρικῇ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλῶν ὠνομασμένη. Ibidem 9. 406: Ἑλος τε καὶ Ἑλεών καὶ Εἰλέσιον ἐκλήθη διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔλεσιν ἰδρύνθαι (comp. on the subject of the name Εἰρέσιον, and the derivation from εἶρεσία Etym. Mag. Εἰρέσιον, p. 303. 11. Sylb.; from Εἰλέσιον and Ἑλεών comp. Homer, Il. 2. 499. 500, and Ibid. Eustath.), Paus. 8. 36. 3. 4. Δημήτηρ ἐν Ἑλει by the Arcadian Methydrium, Etymol. Mag. p. 327. 32: Ἑλεεῖς δῆμος τῆς Ἀττικῆς—ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔλους. According to this, the origin of the name Hellenes might be referred to the mother-province of the tribe Thessaly. From ἔλος was likewise derived the name *Hellopia*, the tract of country around Dodona, Apollodor. ap. Str. 7. 328; which, from its proximity, must likewise become the object of attention in etymological enquiries; for the invocation of the Dodonæan Jove by Achilles, Ζεῦ ἄνα Δωδωναίε, Hom. Il. 16, indicates a connection between the Thessalian Hellenes and the Pelasgic sanctuary. It was very early supposed that there was another Dodona besides the one in Epirus, and that it was situate in Thessaly; according to Hom. Il. 2. 750, not altogether without reason; but now the former was

derived from the Thessalian (Suid. ap. Strab. 7. 329, and Cineas ap. Steph. Byz. Fragm. *Δωδώνη*), the invocation of Achilles was referred to the latter (Philox. ap. Steph. Byz. Fragm. *Δωδώνη*), and the Hellenes were consequently represented as Thessalian Autochthones; herein, however, the assumption of a Hellen prevented the name from being derived from the country, whilst the genealogical poetry likewise created a founder for the ancient name of the Greeks, *Γραικοί*, (see Apoll. 47. 3. Marm. Par. Ep. 6. 11. According to Euseb. Chron. 226, Thessalus is the son of Græcus; according to Stephan. Byzant. (*Γραικός*) Græcus the son of Thessalus). Both the critical scepticism of Strabo (7. 329. *Σουΐδας—τοῖς Θετταλοῖς μυθώδεις λόγους προσχαριζόμενος—Κινέας δ' ἔτι μυθωδέστερον . . .*), and the decisive testimony of Aristotle on the subject of Dodona, Meteor. 1. 14, *ἄκουσιν γὰρ οἱ Σέλλοι ἐνταῦθα, καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι τότε μὲν Γραικοί, νῦν δὲ Ἕλληνες*, are strong arguments against supposing the Thessalian Dodona to have been the parent of the Epirot, and consequently against deducing the names *Ἑλλοπία* and *Σέλλοι* from Thessaly. For neither Helli nor Selli dwelt in Thessaly, but belonged to the Epirot Dodona (see Strab. 7. 328), and the local appellations about the Epirot Dodona are apparently indigenous there. See, on the subject of the habitations of the Selli *Ἑλλοπία*, as well as the river *Σελλήεις*, Hesiod and Philochorus ap. Strab. 7. 328. According to the words of Aristotle, indeed, the *Γραικοί* or subsequent Hellenes, although they came originally from the environs of the Dodonæan sanctuary, were not identical with the Selli; but, like the common mother-district, there appears to have been a common primitive word connected with that sanctuary. This is *Ἐλα* or *Ἑλλά*, the name of the Dodonæan sanctuary itself, which continued in use amongst the Laconians (Hesych. 1. 1159. 1180: *Ἑλλά—Διὸς ἱερὸν ἐν Δωδώνῃ, Λάκωνες*). Hence the *Ἑλλοί* and the *Σέλλοι*, which word Hesychius gives as the interpretation of *Ἑλλοί*, appear to have derived their name (Hesych. 1. 1181. 82).

Now when the close connection between the tribe of the Hellenes and the Pelasgic sanctuary is thus demonstrated, and evidences of a migration from the north-west are clearly perceptible, we cannot help feeling surprise at the destiny of the word *Γραικοί*, and testimonies in support of its continued use amongst the Greeks have been vainly sought in the *Γραικες* of Alcman and Sophocles (see Steph. Byz. *Γραικός*; compare Prid. Marm. Oxon. 369). The name exclusively belongs to the earlier western home of the Hellenes; under the latter name they appear in Thessaly. On the other hand, the name *Γραικοί* disappears in Epirus, and is only found again amongst the Romans, after whose political influence upon Egypt the Alexandrines likewise used *Γραικοί* (Callimach. Fragm. 104; Lycophr. 605). Without contesting the authenticity of the account of the Pelasgic migration to Italy, I merely direct attention to the circumstance, that the primeval navigation of the Etruscans in the Ionian sea, and the intercourse with Epirus and even with Dodona, at a time when the word was still preserved in the former, might have brought it to Italy, which would explain how it came into use among the Romans. It is very certain that the Romans were acquainted with it before their immediate connection with Epirus, for their intercourse with the Italiots had commenced long before, and it is natural to suppose that they would have adopted the word Hellenes from them.

VII.

On the Words πάτρα, φρατρία, φυλή, in the Fragment of Dicæarchus in Steph. Byzant.

§ 16. n. 4; § 30. 43; § 35. 12.

Our object requires a special illustration of the celebrated fragment of Dicæarchus in Steph. Byzantin. in v. *πάτρα*, notwithstanding the able manner in which the subject has been treated by Buttmann in his excellent dissertation (Abh. d. Berl. Ak. d. W. Philol. Hist. Cl.

1818-19, p. 12, sqq.) This must be preceded by the fragment itself, with the requisite emendations of the corrupt text, wherein I follow Buttmann: Πάτρα ἐν τῶν τριῶν τῶν παρ' Ἑλλησι κοινωνίας εἰδῶν, ὡς Δικαιάρχος, ἃ δὴ καλοῦμεν πάτραν, φρατρίαν, φυλήν. Ἐκλήθη δὲ πάτρα μὲν· εἰς τὴν δευτέραν μετάβασιν ἐλθόντων ἢ κατὰ μόνας ἐκάστῳ πρότερον οὔσα συγγένεια, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου τε καὶ μάλιστα ἰσχύσαντος ἐν τῷ γένει τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχουσα, ὃν ἂν τρόπον Αἰακίδας ἢ Πελοπίδας εἴποι τις ἄν.

Φατρίαν (instead of πατρίαν) δὲ συνέβη λέγεσθαι καὶ φρατρίαν, ἐπειδὴ τινες εἰς ἑτέραν πάτραν (instead of φράτραν) ἐδίδοσαν θυγατέρας ἑαυτῶν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔτι τῶν πατριωτικῶν ἱερῶν εἶχε κοινωνίαν ἢ δοθεῖσα, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν τοῦ λαβόντος αὐτὴν συνετέλει πάτραν. "Ωστε πρότερον πόθῳ τῆς συνόδου γιγνομένης ἀδελφαῖς σὺν ἀδελφῷ, ἑτέρα τις ἱερῶν ἐτέθη κοινωνικὴ σύνοδος, ἣν δὴ φρατρίαν (instead of πατρίαν) ὠνόμαζον· καὶ πάλιν ὥστε πάτρα μὲν ὅνπερ εἴπομεν ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας τρόπον ἐγένετο μάλιστα τῆς (instead of τοῖς) γονέων σὺν τέκνοις καὶ τέκνων (instead of τέκνα) σὺν γονεῦσι, φρατρία δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

Φυλὴ δὲ καὶ φυλέται πρότερον (πρώτον?) ὠνομάσθησαν ἐκ (?) τῆς εἰς τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ καλούμενα ἔθνη συνόδου γενομένης· ἕκαστον γὰρ τῶν συνελθόντων φύλον ἐλέγετο εἶναι.

The chief fact to be borne in mind here is, that Dicæarchus did not conceive or wish to explain the various actually-existing social unions historically, but proposed to ascertain philosophically the fundamental principles of human society with the internal pledges and sureties for its subsistence, and to exhibit the root of the *κοινωνία* in three successive gradations, from the union of a family to that of a state, in connection with which the subsequent modifications of human associations, considered from particular points of view, constitute the materials of history.

Dicæarchus sets out with an original simple relation, a separate existence—ἢ κατὰ μόνας, etc. This tacitly im-

plies marriage, Aristot. Pol. 1. 1. 4: *Ἀνάγκη δὴ πρῶτον συνδυάζεσθαι τοὺς ἄνευ ἀλλήλων μὴ δυναμένους εἶναι, οἷον θῆλυ μὲν καὶ ἄρρεν τῆς γενέσεως ἕνεκεν*. Comp. § 6: *Ἡ μὲν οὖν εἰς πᾶσαν ἡμέραν συνεστηκυῖα κοινωνία κατὰ φύσιν οἶκός ἐστιν, κ. τ. λ.*; for the ancient philosophers did not occupy themselves with speculations on the condition of the man before he found the woman, such as are contained in modern so-called histories of mankind, of which that of Jenisch is a specimen. The next stage (*δευτέρα μετάβασις*) is, according to Dicæarchus, the relation between father and children. He conceives this as a genealogical line developing itself downwards within itself, the individual members of which all trace themselves up to one progenitor; this is called *πάτρα*, and its members are designated by a patronymic—Anacidæ, etc. This is conformable to the idiom of the language; thus in Hom. Il. 13. 354, speaking of Jupiter and Neptune, *ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμὸν γένος ἡδ' ἴα πάτρη*, on which the Schol. Min. remarks *ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς*. Comp. Buttmann, ubi sup. p. 17. Thus in Pindar, the poet who pre-eminently sang the glories of lineage and ancestry, Pyth. 8. 53, *πάτραν Μιδυλιδᾶν*; Nem. 4. 125, *πάτραν* of the *Θεανδρίδαι*; 6. 62, of the *Βασσίδαι*; 7. 103, of the *Εὐξενίδαι*; Isthm. 6. 92, of the *Ψαλνχίδαι*. But in the Nem. 8. 79, the *Χαριάδαι* are more than a *πάτρα*. See Dissen ad Nem. 8. p. 450. *Γένος* was synonymous, as in Hom. Il. ubi sup. Compare, on the constitution of Athens, § 44. In Herodotus, in its stead we find *πατριή*, as 2. 143, with reference to Hecataeus; 3. 75, to Cyrus. On the subject of the passages, 1. 200, concerning the Babylonians, see Buttmann, ubi sup. p. 16, 17; and with regard to the Pasargadæ and Achæmenides in Herod., see Buttmann, p. 18, 19. Thence must be emended the Etymol. Orion. 157. 28, which applies *φρήτηρ, φατρία* to the Heraclidæ and Achæmenides. This necessarily implies the assumption of connubial alliances, within the circle of consanguinity, between such as had a common progenitor, consequently in the first instance between brother and sister.

But here it becomes necessary to consider another part of the theory of Dicæarchus. He not only pursues the extension of the family in a descending line, but goes on to examine the connection which formed the basis of marriage, and does not conceive marriage as in itself effecting a bond of union, but as standing in need of a higher sort of relation to cement it and guarantee its validity. This, according to his theory, was during the separate existence of families (*πατράι*) consanguinity, and it forms the first of his three progressive stages of development. To this was added a moral tie in the conjunction of the members of the *Patra* by means of their paternal sanctuaries; but this is not one of its essential and determining principles. Dicæarchus does not pursue this relation through the ramifications which ensue in the natural course of things, viz., brothers and sisters' children, etc. This may be supplied from Cicero de Offic. 1. 17. (—*prima societas in ipso conjugio est; proxima in liberis. . . . Sequuntur fratrum conjunctiones, post consobrinorum sobrinorumque, etc.*)

Dicæarchus next describes the *Phratria*. This was no longer derived from one progenitor, did not propagate itself amongst relations bound by the ties of blood, or belong by community of extraction to one hereditary family-sanctuary. The word does not denote a line descending from a given point, but marks the transitions of the collateral *Patræ* into one another, which took place when the members of one *Patra* gave their daughters in marriage to the members of another, (Cicero ubi sup., *Sequuntur connubia et affinitates*). As marriage could no longer find a guarantee in consanguinity, religion now comes forward as the determining and cementing principle of this second stage of social development. The virgin who quits her father's house is no longer a sharer of the paternal sacrificial hearth, but enters the religious communion of her husband, and this gave sanctity to the marriage tie. Here, too, Dicæarchus does not follow out his principle, one of the consequences of which was, that by bringing about the reciprocal admission to the hereditary

worship of such as were not connected by blood, a tie was not merely contracted between the two married persons, but also between all the members of the Patræ on either side, the very permission of intermarriage, supposing a relation of this nature to have in some measure preceded, and the marriage thus concluded being thereby maintained. Hence communion of worship, and the pledge it afforded for the integrity of the marriage tie, are the distinctive features of the Phratría. The word itself denotes the peculiar description of alliance contracted in it, which was of a fraternal character. Its derivation from φράτηρ, brother, (Hesych. φρητήρ · ἀδελφός. Compare, on this point, as on the forms φατρία, etc., Buttmann ubi sup. p. 32. 34.) does not serve to trace lineal relationship to its original source, but implies the reduction of that affinity which existed between collaterals of the same degree to the simplest possible relation of such a nature, namely, that between brother and sister as co-ordinate relatives.

Dicæarchus now lays down the political tie as the third principle of human society, the first having been consanguinity between parents and children, brother and sister, and the second fraternity between members of various Patræ. This is the association of tribes into a state. He here appears to have omitted one stage, namely, the principle of the tribe itself, as composed of Phratrias (φύλον); but for this, according to his scale, he could only have laid down the propagation of the religious principle by means of the extending Phratrias, and during the still imperfect infancy of the political, but not such a one as was independent of, and essentially different from, those two; he therefore passes over the ulterior development of the Phratría, in which, however, we must not omit to notice the remark at the conclusion—ἐκαστον γὰρ τῶν συνελθόντων φύλον ἐλέγετο εἶναι; and only particularizes the moment when a new principle, viz., the political, is introduced, as the confederation of the φύλα to a state, whose constituent parts are afterwards represented by the φυλαί, φρατρίαι, etc., (Hom. Il. 2. 362: κατὰ φύλα καὶ φρήτρας; 2. 840: φύλα Πελασγῶν; 17. 220:

—ἐπικούρων, etc. Comp. § 44. on the Attic constitution), the point where the development attained maturity, and beyond which the scale of Dicæarchus does not extend.

VIII.

The Words δῆμος, ἄστυ, πόλις, ἀκρόπολις, κοινόν, λαοί, ἄστοι, πολῖται.

§ 16. n. 7; § 21. n. 5. 6; § 23. n. 1; § 32. n. 3. 5. 30;
§ 48. n. 35.

The above words having occurred so frequently in scattered portions of the text, I have thought it advisable to collect them here, and make their relation to one another the subject of a separate discussion; but in so doing, it is very far from my intention to enter into a philological investigation of those expressions in their full extent, or even to make a complete collection of examples for that purpose, which might without difficulty be adduced in almost any number.

The word δῆμος originally expressed the ground and soil of the province or canton, (the derivation from δέω ligo—hominum multitudo, societatis vinculo colligata et in civitatis formam redacta, in Damm and Lennep, although apparently consistent as regards the literal meaning of the word, is by no means consonant to the course of ideas connected with it; it seems more natural to derive it from the Doric δᾶ than from γᾶ, or still more so from δέμω); hence πῶν is the epithet applied to it in Hom. Il. 5. 710; Od. 3. 201, and in many other passages; Hesiod. Theog. 477, etc. But the notion of the dwellers in the district is frequently added, and country and people are understood together; thus ἐκ δήμου ἔλασεν, Il. 6. 158, ἐν δήμῳ μένει, 9. 630; θεὸς δ' ὥς τίετο δήμῳ, Il. 5. 78. etc.; to which ἔνδημος, Hesiod. Op. et Di. 223, and so far land and people are represented as separate, as Odys. 8. 558: Εἰπὲ δέ μοι γαῖάν τε τεῆν, δῆμόν τε, πόλιν τε; conf. 13. 233: τίς γῆ; τίς δῆμος; where δῆμος can scarcely be referred to a part of the country, or in

fine to the people alone. Here we will first examine the word in the signification of locality.

An essential ingredient of an heroic district was the citadel (*ἄστυ, πόλις, πτολίεθρον*), but, like the heroes who towered above the mass of the people, it is rather described as something added to, than as included in the district, as *πόλην τε παντί τε δήμῳ*, Il. 3. 50; *δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε*, Odyss. 6. 3. Hesiod. Op. et Di. 527. In the same manner the *ἐκτίμενον πτολίεθρον* and *δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος*, Il. 2. 546. 547, whether Homeric or Solonic is immaterial. In expressing the opposition between town and country, other words are generally employed; e. g. *κατὰ πτόλιν, ἢ κατ' ἀγρούς*, Odyss. 17. 18: *γῆν τε καὶ ἄστυ*, Theog. 866: *κατὰ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν*, Lycurg. adv. Leocr. 136. R. ed.

It is impossible to determine which of the two appellations, *ἄστυ* and *πόλις*, is the more ancient. With the subsequent progress of society, however, *ἄστυ* retained its signification of place only, the town as opposed to the country (*ἄστυδε ἰέναι*, Il. 18. 255.), whilst *πόλις* also had a political notion attached to it. As in reality the reputed cities or towns of the heroic age were only citadels, whilst towns were subsequently erected below them, (Strabo, 8. 336. 337. 386; conf. above, § 32.), so the original signification of *ἄστυ* was—citadel. Thus, in the passage of the Etymol. Mag., *Εὐπατρίδαι ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ αὐτὸ τὸ ἄστυ οἰκοῦντες καὶ μετέχοντες βασιλικοῦ γένους*, κ. τ. λ. Compare under *Ἀστυπαλαία*, that at the settlement of the Greeks in Samos the Carian citadel, which was already erected there, received the name of *Ἀστυπαλαία*. Therefore *αἰπὺν—Νηληϊῶν ἄστυ*, Mimnerm. Frag. 9. 1; ed. Gaisford. Assuming Troy, Thebes, Calydon, etc., to have been citadels with a lower town, then *κῆρυξ ἄστυβοώτης*, Il. 24. 701, and the *μεγά* in *ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου*, Il. 2. 332. 803; 16. 448. *ἐνέπρηθον μέγα ἄστυ*, (Calydon) 9. 585, become significant, and at the same time *πόλιν καὶ ἄστυ*, 17. 144, which, at all events, contains more than the pretended pleonasm, might rather be interpreted in reference to upper and

lower town, than town and state. To the same effect is in Simonides Frag. 20. 3. Gaisf. πόλιν Γλαύκοιο Κορίνθιον ἄστυ.

However, ἄστυ was not the only appellation for the citadel; πόλις also had this signification, and it was not till more recent times that the word ἀκρόπολις was formed from the Homeric πόλις ἄκρη (Il. 6. 88. 257, etc.), together with which, however, in the antique and diplomatic style, πόλις continued to be employed in reference to citadel. Thus, on the subject of that of Athens, Thucyd. 5. 18. 23. 47, Aristoph. Lysistrata, 754. 758. 912. Comp. Pausan. 1. 26. 7. Mœris, πόλιν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν καὶ πολιάδα Ἀττικῶς, Pollux, 9. 40; Ammonius, οἰκίζεται; moreover, of the Cadmea in Thebes; Plutarch, Pelop. 18: the ἱερὸς λόχος was called ὁ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως λόχος, then τὰς ἀκροπόλεις ἐπιεικῶς οἱ τότε πόλεις ὠνόμαζον. However, Plutarch likewise says ἄκρα for it, thus Timol. 11. 18. The word πόλις became the general designation of the subsequent lower towns, and Athens claimed for itself, by way of distinction, the denomination of ἄστυ.

Πόλις alone became extended into a political designation for the state. In Homer there are few or no passages in which this signification is clearly perceptible; in the poems of Hesiod there are more, as Op. et Di. 238, the whole state (ξύμπασα πόλις) suffers for the injustice of one; again, 225, on the flourishing condition of the state under a just prince, τέθηλε πόλις. Conf. 220, et Scut. Herc. 380. 474. It is unnecessary to bring forward examples from later times; nevertheless see Herod. 3. 39. concerning the island of Samos, 8. 66. of five other island states, and Thucyd. 1. 122:—καὶ κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ ἕκαστον ἄστυ—and afterwards πόλεις τοσάσδε ὑπὸ μιᾶς κακοπαθεῖν, where, in the first passage, ἄστυ seems to signify the individual place, in the second πόλις the state.

The word κοινὸν conveys a purely abstract notion, and therefore was not introduced till comparatively late. A prelude to its subsequent use is found in Hesiod. Op. et Di. 721. a repast ἐκ κοινοῦ. Herodotus uses it in speaking of states and state leagues: τὸ κοινοῦ Σπαρτιητέων, 6.

50; Ἀθηναίων, 7. 144; Ἰώνων, 5. 109; Demosthenes de Coron. 278. 279. of the Amphictyons, etc. See Tittmann, Griechische Staatsverfass. 400, sqq. We now come to those cases in which it was employed to express people. Δῆμος, as already remarked, conveys the notion of the district with its inhabitants, as well as of the latter alone, thus ἄνδρες ἀγρόμενοι, πᾶς δῆμος, Il. 20. 166. It is true that many passages either express or imply the same opposition as existed between the Roman plebs, in its claims to the rights of the collective community, and the patricians, for δῆμος is almost universally used as a designation for the above-mentioned mass of the rural population dependent upon the prince or nobles, and in accordance with the progress of society in the interior of the Grecian states, the πόλις, as possessed of superior rights (examples of the former kind are: τὰ δ' ἄλλα ἐς δῆμον ἔδωκε δαιτρεῦειν, Il. 11. 703; ὃν δ' αὖ δῆμον ἄνδρα ἴδοι, 2. 198. Comp. 188. and 12. 273; δῆμον φῆμις, Od. 14. 239, etc.; thus δῆμῳ κενεόφρονι, Theogn. 845; δῆμον φιλοδέσποτον, 847; δῆμος in the celebrated verses of Solon: Δῆμῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκα τόσον κράτος, ὅσον ἐπαρκεῖ, κ. τ. λ. (see Plut. Sol. 18); hither must be referred ὁ δᾶμος as an appellation of the Spartan community, so far as it was subject to the influence of the kings and gerontes (Plut. Lyc. 6). Of the latter description are those given above of the conjunction of πόλις and δῆμος, comp. Theogn. 924). But it cannot be denied, that as early as in the Homeric poems δῆμος seems in many passages to signify the whole people, including the noble proprietors of the citadels, thus in the obscure passage: χρέος, ὃ οἱ πᾶς δῆμος ὄφελλε, Odyss. 21. 17. 307; ἀριστῆες κατὰ δῆμον, 6. 34; comp. 8. 36. and 390. Comp. Callinus Frag. v. 16, δῆμῳ φίλος; Archiloch. Frag. 84. 3. Gaisf. The δῆμος assembles for the purpose of celebrating athletic games. This may be applied to δῆμος in the compounds βασιλεὺς δημοβόρος, Il. 1. 231; δημόφαγον τύραννον, Theogn. 1183. The word δῆμος was not applied to the whole state till the rise of the democracies. But after the great migrations another change occurred, when the demus,

which nevertheless long continued to be a subordinate class in the ancient democracies, upon the erection of larger towns was received into the city, and the inhabitants of the country were thenceforward distinguished by the name of Pericæci. However, an individual of the *δημος* is not yet called *δημότης* in the poems of Homer.

But the word *δημος*, in consequence of the signification of the population being combined with that of the country, only denotes the existing mass of the people without imagining it in political activity; on the other hand, the notion of the people in action is expressed by the word *λαοί*. This word seems to be as ancient as the use of it is frequent, and most important appellations for objects of public life in ancient Greece were derived from it. It seems to have signified originally armed military bands (*λαῶν ἀσπισταῶν*, Il. 4. 91), and almost all the passages in Homer in which the word occurs may be thus interpreted. This is the sense in which it is employed as late as Herod. 5. 42, where it is said of Dorieus the Spartan, *αἰτήσας ληόν*, viz., to a march; thus in Tyrtæus, *Fragn. 3. 24, ἄστυ τε καὶ λαοῦς*. The same sense is discernible in *ἀρχέλεως* (Æschyl. Pers. 296); *λαγέτας* (Pind. Pyth. 3. 151; 4. 191; 10. 50); *λαοσσόος*, Hesiod. Scut. Herc. 3. 37; *Λαομέδων*, *λαοφόρος ὁδός*, (the road of the army, Il. 15. 682,) etc; perhaps even in *Ἀχιλλεύς*, and allied to it is the favourite designation *στράτος* for people, in Pindar (Ol. 5. 28; 9. 143, etc. Comp. Æsch. Pers. 423, Sophocl. Philoct. 384.) However, the word was likewise directed to other operations of the people in their public capacity, as in the heroic age they always went armed. Hence arose the expression in religious ceremonies, *σίγα πᾶς ἔστω λεώς*, Eurip. Hec. 536; *οἱ πάντες λεῶ*, Aristoph. Av. 1225, in which the remarkable use of the plural seems to convey the notion of single groups. Moreover, the *λαοί* in the popular assembly in Hesiod, Theogon. 84. 430, etc. The Thessalian *λήϊτον* (ap. Herodot. 7. 197.) for *πρυτανεῖον*, *λήϊτος* for the later *δημόσιος*, the compounds *λειτουργία*, etc.

The words *ἀστός* and *πολίτης* became general at a

later period. The former, however, is found in Homer, Il. 11. 242; Od. 13. 192; afterwards more frequently than πολίτης, in Archilochus, Theognis, and the other poets of the age preceding the Persian war, in Pindar, the Attic, etc. Ἀστός not only designated the townsman, but likewise the citizen of the state, as in contradistinction to ξένος in Pindar, Olymp. 13. 2. 3; 7. 166; Pyth. 5. 75; Isthm. 1. 75; 6. 102. Πολίτης, on the other hand, only denoted the citizen of the state, or, in a larger circuit, the native of the country, but not more particularly than ἀστός, the townsman, as the Schol. ad Eurip. Phœn. 894. wishes to represent: Πολίται οἱ πόλιν οἰκοῦντες ἀπλῶς καὶ ἐν πόλει τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποιούμενοι· ἀστοὶ δὲ οἱ ἰθαγενεῖς πολίται (this, as far as relates to the more ancient use, is not untrue,) ὧν τοῖς μὲν ἀντικεῖνται οἱ ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς τὴν οἴκησιν ἔχοντες (here is the error), τοῖς δὲ ἀστοῖς οἱ ξένοι (where it may have been occasioned by the opposition in Pindar already alluded to).

IX.

The confederacy of the Doric Tribes in the Peloponnesus.

· § 29. n. 5.

The confederacy of the Dorians in the Peloponnesus is mentioned in a remarkable passage, Plato, de Legg. 3. 684: Βασιλεῖαι τρεῖς βασιλευόμεναις πόλεσι τριτταῖς ὥμοσαν ἀλλήλαις ἐκάτεραι κατὰ νόμους, οὓς ἔθεντο, τοῦτε ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι κοινούς, οἱ μὲν, μὴ βιαιοτέραν τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιήσεσθαι, προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τοῦ γένους· οἱ δὲ, ταῦτα ἐμπεδούντων τῶν ἀρχόντων, μήτε αὐτοὶ τὰς βασιλείας ποτὲ καταλύσειν, μήτ' ἐπιτρέψειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν ἑτέροις, βοηθήσειν δὲ βασιλεῖς τε βασιλεύειν ἀδικουμένοις καὶ δήμοις, καὶ δῆμοι δῆμοις καὶ βασιλεῦσιν ἀδικουμένοις. The mythico-philosophical tenor of this apparently historical statement may be gathered from Plat. Critias, 120, D. E., where a similar league is attributed to the Atlantic princes. But it may be

safely assumed, that at the beginning of the march the leaders and the hordes swore to remain faithful allies to one another, (comp. concerning the oath of the Spartan kings, § 42. n. 74), and that they afterwards gave each other a guarantee for the undisturbed enjoyment of their conquests. It is likewise necessary to examine the tradition preserved in Strabo, 8. 333, and Pausanias, 4. 3. 3, respecting the casting of lots for the possession of the Peloponnesus. The assertion that this circumstance took place before the conquest, is untenable; and there are strong reasons against ascribing it to the period immediately after its achievement, for this no sooner happened than dissension broke out. The accession of Arcadia to the Doric league had an influence upon the fact, as well as upon the tradition, Paus. 5. 4. 1; 8. 29. 4; Polyæn. 1. 7. Without this the whole conquest might have been defeated; but in this manner the Dorians, after the victory over Tisamenus, were led to the three tracts of country which had been united under the Pelopidæ, and to this period must probably be referred both the drawing of lots and the above-mentioned alliance, in which the Arcadians must be included (see below, the account in Pausanias), unless it should be assumed that the partition of the army, and the actual occupation by which it was succeeded, were dilated into the tradition concerning the drawing of lots, whilst the success of Cresphontes, in reducing the fruitful Messenia to subjection, was construed into a proof of foul play in drawing (Polyæn. 1. 6; Schol. Soph. Ajax, 1271). The subsequent efficiency of the offensive and defensive alliance against external aggression and internal revolution may be faintly discerned in the tradition preserved to us in Pausanias, 4. 3. 5, which recounts that the fugitive Æpytus was brought back to Messenia by the Arcadians, Spartans, and Argives. According to Pausanias, 3. 5. 8, Argos was said to have called in the assistance of that league upon being attacked by Agesipolis; but it is evident, from Xenoph. Hell. 4. 7. 2, that this does not mean a general convention amongst the tribes,

but only a festival during which hostilities were suspended (according to Dodwell the Isthmia, see Schneider ad Xenoph. ubi supra).

X.

The expressions πατρόθεν and παῖς τίνος.

§ 30. n. 21. and § 44. n. 10.

One of those expressions which denote the value set upon birth and descent, is πατρόθεν. The honourable distinction which it implied may be perceived as early as in Homer, Il. 10. 68, in Agamemnon's exhortation to Menelaus, to address the heroes:

Πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον
πάντας κυδαίνων.

Afterwards Herod. 6. 14. relates that the Samian state had granted to the brave men who had fought in the engagement off Lade, ἐν στήλῃ ἀναγραφῆναι πατρόθεν. In Thucydides, 7. 69, Nicias calls upon each of the Trierarchs, πατρόθεν ἐπονομάζων. Compare Plutarch, Pelop. 28. It would almost appear like an exception to the custom generally observed at funerals, when Pausanias remarks, that the Sicyonians had not called upon the defunct πατρόθεν (p. 2. 7. 5). Hither, moreover, must be referred the expression in Eurip. Rhes. 298: τίς ὁ στρατηγὸς καὶ τίνος κεκλημένος? Hence it so frequently happens that the name of the son is not mentioned at all, that of his father being employed to distinguish him, as Ἀχιλλέως παῖ, Soph. Philoct. 50. Comp. 57. 92. 96. 304. 384. 452, etc. This serves to explain Æsch. Pers. 144, where Xerxes is called Δαρειογενῆς, τὸ πατρωνύμον γένος ἀμέτερον. Another expression of the same thought is παῖδες, υἱες, with the genitive of a word signifying a class. This involves an extension of the custom of mentioning the name of the father in honour of the son, to an aggregate body, the honour, authority, and rights of which are regarded as the lineal heritage of an

individual belonging to it. For example, in Homer passim, *υῖες Ἀχαιῶν*; in the same manner, *παῖδες Ἑλευσινίων*, Hom. Hymn. in Cerer. 266; *παῖδες Ἑλλάνων*, Æschyl. Persæ, 408; *παῖδες Ἀνδῶν*, Herod. 1. 27; *Ἰώνων*, 5. 49; *Ἀθηναίων*, 5. 77; *Θηβαίων παῖδες*, Plut. Alcib. 2; *Μήδων παισὶ*, Plut. Cim. 7; *Ἀνδρῶν*, Plut. Qu. Gr. 7. 192, R. ed. And even *παῖδες ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν*, Plat. Menex. 246, B.

Hence finally arose the use of *παῖδες*, with a genitive of artists, physicians, orators, etc., as *παῖδες ῥητόρων*, Dionys. Halic. Syntax. p. 313. *ιατρῶν*, etc. See the examples in Blomfield ad Æsch. Pers. 409, which originally referred to the ancient custom of propagating science and art within the circle of particular families, *παῖδες ἱατρῶν* being nearly equivalent to the Asclepiadæ.

XI.

Autochthones in Attica.

§ 30. n. 45.

Autochthony, the best legal title to the possession of a country, served to reflect lustre upon such Grecian tribes as laid claim to the character, in two ways. First, it added the embellishments of fable to their origin as natives of a district; this, by means of an extreme interpretation, being represented as a growing out of the very ground and soil of the country. This is visible in the legendary poetry of Asius concerning Pelasgus, Pausan. 8. 1. 2:

Ἀντίθεον δὲ Πελασγὸν ἐν ὑψικόμοισιν ὄρεσσι
Γαῖα μέλαιν' ἀνέδωκεν, ἵνα θνητῶν γένος εἴη;

next in the traditions of the Theban Sparti (see above, § 30. n. 23), the Æginetan Myrmidons (see § 13. n. 3), which three tribes Hellanicus enumerated together with the Athenians as Autochthonic (Harpocr. *αὐτόχθονες*). But this is not the point of view from which we have to consider the Attic Autochthones. The word Autoch-

thones was employed in the sense of Eupatridæ; Moeris: *Εὐπατρίδαι Ἀττικῶς· αὐτόχθονες Ἑλληνικῶς*; Schol. Soph. Electr. 25: *Εὐπατρίδαι δὲ παρ' Ἀττικοῖς οἱ αὐτόχθονες καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο περιφανεῖς*. The pride of Autochthony must, it is true, have been chiefly cherished amongst the Attic Eupatridæ; nevertheless it afterwards passed over to the whole of the ancient citizens of Athens. Now this Autochthonic nobility, the much-renowned political heritage of the Athenians, to the enjoyment of which the body of the people forced their way, arrogating to themselves by virtue of this title the honourable appellation of Eupatridæ, did not, like the mythical Autochthony already mentioned, rest upon the assertion that their forefathers had grown out of the earth, but was chiefly considered with reference to its negative qualities, namely, that the Athenians had never departed from their original seats, whereas other tribes had only become the occupants of theirs after repeated migrations*, and that in consequence of its greater antiquity the nationality of Attica was entitled to greater respect. Hence Aristoph. Vesp. 1076: *Ἀττικοὶ μόνοι δικαίως εὐγενεῖς αὐτόχθονες*. Demosth. de Falsa Legat. 424. 28: the Arcadians, like the Athenians, were said to have a high feeling of liberty, *μόνοι γὰρ τῶν πάντων ὑμεῖς αὐτόχθονές ἐστε καί κείνοι*.

XII.

Πελάται, θῆτες.

§ 32. n. 14.

The words *πελάται* and *θῆτες* do not signify bond-slaves, like the Penestæ, Helots, etc. Aristotle apud Phot. explains *Πελάται*—*οἱ μισθῷ δουλεύοντες· ἐπεὶ τὸ πέλας ἐγγύς· οἶον ἐγγιστα διὰ πενίαν προσιόντες*.

* I strongly suspect that the generalization of Herodotus (1. 56), in his accounts of the stationary (Attic and Arcadian) Pelasgians and the migratory (Dorian) Hellenes, is based upon the Attic Autochthony, though without any express claims to superior authority.

Comp. Phot. *θῆτες οἱ ἕνεκα τροφῆς δουλεύοντες; θητεύειν* — *μισθῷ ἐργάζεσθαι*. *Δουλεύειν* is by no means to be understood as a permanent bondage, like that transmitted by inheritance amongst the Helots, etc., but as a service for wages, in which light it was viewed both by the payer and the receiver. See Pollux, 3. 82: *Πελάται* (the reading *πενέσται* is corrupt) *δὲ καὶ θῆτες ἐλευθέρων ἐστὶν ὀνόματα διὰ πενίαν ἐπ' ἀργυρίῳ δουλεύοντων* (more correctly *θητεούντων*). Comp. Timæus, Plat. Lex.: *Πελάτης ὁ ἀντὶ τροφῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ προσπελάζων*, and Ruhnken ad loc. p. 211. The *θῆτες*, as early as in Homer's time, appear in the character of wandering labourers for hire, (see above, § 16. n. 24; Odyss. 4. 644. *θῆτές τε δμῶές τε*, where *θῆτες* must not be regarded as classed amongst the house-slaves, *δμῶες*); *θητεύειν* is a voluntary service for wages (see Damm Lex. Homer. et Pind. *θητεύω*). It must be confessed that the relation of the Attic *θῆτες*, viz., that of resident agricultural labourers, was of a different nature; still it was by no means one of bondage. *Πελάτης* passed into the signification of a person recommended to protection, client, *πρόσφυξ*, see Ammon. *πελαστής*; comp. Etymol. Gud. *πελαστής*; and Valck. ad Amm. ubi sup. The comparison of servants of this description with Helots, etc., was certainly supported by analogy. Theopompus ap. Athen. 10. 443. B., mentions *προσπελάται* of the Ariæans (comp. 6. 271. D., where *Ἀρκαδίους* is incorrectly used), and compares them with the Helots; perhaps correctly, for here the word must not be taken in its strict acceptance. But it is a mere error in writing, when in Suidas, *πενέσται*, the Penestæ, are compared with the Attic Thetes, (here *πελάται* must be understood as was corrected above in Pollux); the same remark applies to the Etymol. Mag. *Εἰλωτες—οἱ μισθῷ δουλεύοντες ἐλεύθεροι*.

XIII.

*The Attic Cleruchiæ in the Territory of Chalcis
in Eubœa.*

§ 35. n. 47.

Soon after the Athenians had shaken off the tyranny, and overcome the allied Chalcidians and Thebans, they sent four thousand citizens as Cleruchi to take possession of those lands which had before belonged to the Chalcidian Hippobotæ. Herod. 5. 77. This number of Cleruchi is very large, but it does not exceed the bounds of credibility. On the other hand, the number forty in *Æl. V. H. 6. 1*, as well as that contained in the other reading, viz., two thousand, are manifestly inaccurate; the latter number refers to the Cleruchiæ, which were apportioned by Pericles after the reduction of Histiaæa, (*Strabo, 10. 445. from Theopompus:—δισχιλίους δ' ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἐλθόντας τὸν Ὀρεὸν οἰκῆσαι, δῆμον ὄντα πρότερον τῶν Ἰστιαιέων*), though *Diodor. 12. 22.* only states one thousand. But Herodotus (9. 28.) at the time of Xerxes reckons no more than four hundred Chalcidians in the Grecian army at Plataæa, which renders the former number four thousand suspicious. But it is still more doubtful whether the Chalcidians who occur afterwards are to be considered as the original Hippobotæ and their attendants, or as Athenian Cleruchi. Böckh (*Pub. Econ. 1. 458.*) leaves the question undecided. There is no positive evidence of the continuance of the Athenian Cleruchiæ; neither did a restoration of the authority of the Hippobotæ take place; a third state of things seems to have been established: Chalcis became tributary to Athens. The four thousand Athenians left Eubœa upon the approach of Darius' army, Herod. 6. 100; on the other hand, soon after the war between Athens and Chalcis, the captive Hippobotæ had been restored in consideration of a ransom, Herod. 5. 77. Now there is reason to think that the latter were, upon

the evacuation of Eubœa by the Athenians, reinstated in the possession of their demesnes, and that Athens exacted a tribute as a compensation. For after that time the Chalcidians are nowhere characterized as possessing equal rights with the citizens of Athens, but are always described as tributary subjects; thus Thuc. 7. 57: τῶν μὲν ὑπηκόων καὶ φόρου ὑποτελῶν Ἑρετριεῖς καὶ Χαλκιδεῖς, etc.; comp. 6. 76, that the Athenians Χαλκιδεάς — δουλωσαμένους ἔχειν. Indeed, according to a statement in Plutarch, Pericl. 23, Pericles drove out Chalcidian Hippobotæ πλούτῳ καὶ δόξῃ διαφέροντας, on which the Schol. Aristoph. Nub. remarks, 204: ἐπολιόρησαν δὲ αὐτὴν (Eubœa) Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ Περικλέους, καὶ μάλιστα Χαλκιδεάς καὶ Ἑρετρίεας. However, I am by no means inclined to answer for the accuracy of Plutarch's account.

XIV.

Τέλος, τελεῖν.

§ 26. n. 18; § 38. n. 1; § 42. n. 68; § 43. n. 32.

The fundamental signification of the expressive word τέλος is not that of the end, as the absence of something formerly present, the negation of a prior existence (as we might be tempted to conclude from θανάτοιο τέλος, Hom. Il. 3. 309.; Hesiod. Op. et Di. 165; Archiloch. Fragm. 51. 3; Theogn. 766. and βιότου τέλος, ibid. 901), but in conformity to its derivation from τέλλω (to come into existence, to be produced, to come to maturity,) it rather conveys the notion that something is realized,, arrives at perfection, attains its final end and aim, (Henr. Steph. vol. 4. 1369. explains it by the Latin word *effectus*). Therefore Hom. Odys. 5. 390. ἡμαρ τέλεσ' ἥως in, the signification of produced, τέλειος arrived at maturity, (to which must be referred τέλος, marriage, first τέλος γάμοιο, Odys. 20. 74, Ἡρα τελεία), τελεσφόρος ἐνιαυτός, bearing fruit, bringing to maturity, then τέλος, fruit itself, enjoyment, Odys. 9. 5:

οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγέ τι φημὶ τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι
ἢ ὅτ' ἂν εὐφροσύνη μὲν ἔχῃ κἄτα δῆμον ἅπαντα.

In this sense, Simonid. Fragm. 98. 2, Gaisford, ἡβης τέλος, matured youth; similarly Mimnerm. 2. 6, τέλος γήραος; 2. 9, τέλος ὥρης (θανάτου τέλος is analogous), the periphrasis betokening the arrival of a state of completion, as the terminating point of the preceding period, which may be denominated “a coming into existence,” but not as the conclusion of a departing state. Comp. Odys. 23. 286: εἰ μὲν δὴ γῆράς γε θεοὶ τελέουσιν ἄρειον. Therefore Ζεὺς πάντων ἐφορᾷ τέλος, implies that Jupiter sees to what consummation, what result any thing will ripen. Comp. the singular use of τελεῖν, Hesiod. Op. et Di. 273, after the complaint that injustice prevailed, ἀλλὰ τάγ’ οὐπω ἔολπα τελεῖν Δία τερπικέραυνον. This leads us to consider its remarkable use in τέλος ἄκρον as the summit, Theog. 594. The same sense may be traced in the ἐς τέλος of Hesiod. Op. et Di. 216. 292. 476. 662. Hence ἔργον τελέσας, Hesiod. Op. et Di. 552, does not so much express the cessation of trouble and labour, as the bringing to bear, the producing. Thus Simonid. Fragm. 65. 3. Gaisf. applies the word to the making of a flute.

In the poems of Homer the words τέλος and τελεῖν are very frequently used as the performance, the action, the work, in reference to a preceding word, promise, foreboding, expectation, wish, exertion. As Il. 1. 108: ἐθλὸν δ’ οὐδέ τί πω εἶπας ἔπος οὐδ’ ἐτέλεσσας; 7. 69: ὄρκια μὲν Κρονίδης ὑψίζυγος οὐκ ἐτέλεσεν; 19. 242: αὐτίκ’ ἔπειθ’ ἅμα μῦθος ἦν, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον; Odys. 4. 776: τελέωμεν μῦθον, etc. Comp. Theog. 640:—βουλαῖς δ’ οὐκ ἐπέγεντο τέλος; 164:—τέλος δ’ ἔργμασιν οὐχ ἔπεται.

Hence proceeded the idea of strength to accomplish, and the power furnished with authority to do so. It occurs in the former sense in Homer, Il. 16. 630: ἐν γὰρ χερσὶ τέλος πολέμου, ἐπέων δ’, ἐνὶ βουλῇ; in Hesiod. Op. et Di. 667, in speaking of Poseidon and Zeus, Ἐν τοῖς γὰρ τέλος ἐστὶν ὁμῶς ἀγαθῶν τε κακῶν τε. From this arose the Pindaric ἐν θεῷ γε μὰν τέλος, Olym̃p. 13. 148; Ζεὺς τέλειος, ibid. 164. The latter gave rise to the

remarkable designation of the magistrates τέλη, οἱ ἐν τέλει, whereby we are led to consider the interchange of signification between τέλος and ἀρχή, which the Greeks followed up in various directions, and which maintained itself in the Latin term *initia* for τελετή; the illustration of this point is, however, foreign to the present design. The first example of the former use of the words τέλος, οἱ ἐν τέλει, τὰ τέλη, I select from the treaty for a suspension of hostilities between Athens and Sparta. Thucyd. 4. 118: εἰ δέ τι ὑμῖν—δικαιότερον τούτων δοκεῖ εἶναι ἰόντες ἐς Λακεδαίμονα διδάσκετε.—οἱ δὲ ἰόντες, τέλος ἔχοντες ἰόντων. Here τέλος is equivalent to κύρος, full power, authority, therefore the ambassadors were, according to the Scholiast, supposed to be κύριοι συμβῆναι ἄνευ τῶν πόλεων. Comp. Schol. 1. 58: τέλη—διὰ τὸ αὐτοὺς τὰ τέλη (τὸ τέλος) τοῖς πράγμασι τιθέναι. To adduce a few of the numerous examples:—first, τέλος is the office; τέλος δυοδεκάμηνον, Pind. Nem. 11. 10, is the office of the Prytanis in Tenedos. Next, with grammatical consistency, the officers, οἱ ἐν τέλει; Soph. Antig. 67: τοῖς ἐν τέλει βεβῶσι πείσομαι. Herodot. 3. 18. of the Ethiopians: τοὺς ἐν τέλει ἐκάστους ἑόντας τῶν ἀστῶν; 9. 106: Πελοποννησίων μὲν τοῖσι ἐν τέλει ἐοῦσι ἐδόκεε. Thuc. 7. 73. of Syracuse: τοῖς ἐν τέλει οὖσιν; 8. 50: τοὺς ἐν τέλει ὄντας, of Samos; 5. 47: οἱ τὰ τέλη ἔχοντες, of Elis. Comp. Budæi, Comment. 227. Sturz, Lexic. Xenoph. τέλος, n. 4. and 5. Duker ad Thucyd. 1. 58. (Οἱ ἐν τέλει, are generally superior, not always the highest magistrates. Therefore, Thucyd. 1. 10:—τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῶν μάλιστα ἐν τέλει; 2. 10. Archidamus convenes τοὺς στρατηγούς τῶν πόλεων πασῶν καὶ τοῖς μάλιστα ἐν τέλει καὶ ἀξιολογωτάτους παρέinari; 5. 60. Agis' council of war, τῶν ἐν τέλει ξυστρατευομένων; 6. 88:—τῶν τε ἐφόρων καὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει ὄντων.)—From signifying the office, the word was at length applied to the officer. Æsch. Sept. con. Theb. 1003: ταῦτ' ἀμφὶ τοῦδ' ἔδοξε Καδμείων τέλει. Τὰ τέλη, often occurs in the same sense, Thuc. 4. 15. 86. 88.

The development of the signification of τελεῖν is

naturally connected with that of τέλος; for as τέλος implies the power of accomplishing, together with the accomplishment itself, so τελεῖν expresses the notion of acting together with that of completing. e. g. Theogn. 690: οὐδ' ἔρδειν ὅτι μὴ λώϊον ἦν τελέσαι. Herewith is associated the notion of a struggling with difficulties during action, which is not, as in the instance alluded to above, supposed to result in the production of a work, but, more in accordance with our ideas, in the attainment of rest and refection. This is already perceptible in τέλος πολέμοιο, Il. 3. 291. In the same manner Theogn. 1168: εὖτ' ἂν ὁδοῦ τελέης τέρματάτ' ἐμπορίης. (Compare the notion of arriving at, or reaching, in the passage of Thucyd. quoted by Henry Steph. 4. 1379.: καὶ ταύτῃ μὲν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἐκ τῆς Μελιτίας ἀφώρμησεν, ἐς Φάρσαλόν τε ἐτέλεσε, etc.) Hesiod. Theogn. 951: τελέσας στονούντας ἀέθλους, comp. 994. 996, and Od. 3. 262; αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν νοῦσον τελέσῃ, 799. To this must be referred Il. 12. 222, of the eagle which was carrying a serpent οὐδ' ἐτέλεσσε φέρων.

Analogous to the signification of accomplishing in reference to a word or promise in τέλος is that of yielding, presenting, in pursuance of an obligation, etc., in τελεῖν. For example, Il. 9. 594: τῷ δ' οὐκέτι δῶρ' ἐτέλεσσαν Αἰτωλοί. Odyss. 11. 351: εἰσόκε πᾶσαν δωτίνην τελέσω. Comp. Il. 21. 457; 23. 20. 180. This is likewise conveyed by the periphrasis μισθοῖο τέλος ὦραι ἐξέφερον, Il. 21. 450. and καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳ λιπαρὰς τελέουσι θέμιστας, whether we here understand gifts (γέρατα), as in the Homeric hymn to Demeter 369. ἐναίσιμα δῶρα τελοῦντες, or the active fulfilment of the princely commands. The former sense became attached to the word in the progress of the public economy which arose after the heroic age. (I have assigned the reasons why I am unable to assent to Böckh's explanation of the word Teleontes, as signifying persons who paid tribute in reference to the Attic Phylæ.) But now a question arises as to whether τὰ τέλη, the military hordes (Il. 7. 380; 11. 729; 18. 298; Herod. 1. 103; 7. 87. 211; 9. 20. 23, etc.)

of the earlier age, are not to be understood in the same manner? Notwithstanding the plausibility of the interpretation "elite," flower of the army, a passage in the *Iliad* would almost lead us to conclude that it signified troops furnished by allies in the manner of our modern contingents; the passage in question is *Il.* 24. 399. 400, where the disguised Argeiphont relates, that upon drawing lots it had devolved to him, as the youngest of seven sons, to go with the army to Troy (*τῶν μεταπαλλόμενος κλήρῳ λάχον ἐνθαδ' ἔπεσθαι*). It seems more natural to explain *τελεῖν εἰς Βοιωτοὺς*, by auxiliary forces, than by any kind of tax, whereas the latter sense is discernible in the terms *θητικόν*, etc.; *τελεῖν*.

Should the attempt to trace the probable connection between the various significations of *τέλος* and *τελεῖν* thus far have been attended with success, it may be added that little can be deduced from the history of the word itself in support of the assertion, that the name of the Attic Teleontes signified consecrated priests, (see above, § 44, and Tittmann, *Griech. Staatsverf.* 570. 571, whose remarks have been incorporated with the present exposition). To fathom the signification of the word *τελεῖν*, to consecrate, in its earliest stages, is a no less ungrateful task than it would be to investigate the subject of the mysteries themselves. But the word obviously very soon began to be employed speculatively, and a symbolical use of it in reference to the mysteries may therefore have arisen at a very early period. This may be asserted of the Eleusinian mysteries with the greater confidence, as the mythical name Teleon occurs in connection with the same, *Apollod.* 3. 15. 1; at the same time comp. 1. 9. 16.

XV.

The statements of the grammarians on the subject of the Attic ἔθνη, φρατρίαι, τριττύες.

§ 44. n. 2. 17. 36.

The object of the following observations is to show, that it cannot be proved from the statements of the grammarians, that the above-named threefold division of the Attic people was into members of one and the same description, or that families formed the subdivision of each of its constituent parts. I here partially repeat, as in previous parts of the Appendix, what I have advanced at various times in academical dissertations, etc., many of which have never entered the more extended circle of the literary world. (To these belongs the “*Programma de tribuum quatuor Atticarum triplici partitione.*” Kilon. 1825.) That the φρατρίαι and τριττύες were identical but without any mention of the ἔθνη, is apparently stated by Suidas, upon what authority I know not, under φράτορες· — φασὶ δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ ἔθνος εἶναι τριττὺν, ἥτοι τὴν φρατρίαν. But either the passage is corrupt, or the statement itself is without meaning. Further, under γεννῆται· — αἱ δὲ φρατρίαι ἐκαλοῦντο τριττύες, ὅτι τεσσάρων φυλῶν οὐσῶν εἰς τρία ἐκάστην διεῖλον μέρη; according to this τριττὺς must have been a mere epithet of φρατρία. Nearly to the same effect are his observations under φατρία· — ἡ φυλὴ διήρηται εἰς δ' — ἐκάστη δὲ διαίρεσις εἰς γ', ὡς γίνεσθαι ιβ' — καλεῖσθαι δὲ τριττύας καὶ φρατρίας. Lastly, the passage in Stephan. Byzant. under the word φρατρία is likewise grossly corrupt: ἐξ ἧς οἱ φράτορες λέγονται οἱ ἐκ τῆς φρατρίας τῆς αὐτῆς ὄντες ὃ ἐστὶ τρίτης φυλῆς (i. e. τρίτον μέρος τῆς φυλῆς) ἣν τινες τριττὸν (τριττὺν) λέγουσιν. But Mæris under γεννῆται· αἱ δὲ φυλαὶ ἐκάστη εἰς τριττύας (διήρηντο), εἰς δὲ ἐκάστην τριττὺν εἰσήχθη γένη λ', mentions the Trittyes as the only subdivision of the Phylæ.

All the parts of the triple division occur in Harpo-

cratio and Suidas, who copied from him, under *γεννηται*· —*ἐκάστη δὲ φυλὴ τριχῇ διήρητο καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ἕκαστον μέρος τούτων (τοιούτων?) τριττὺς καὶ ἔθνος καὶ φρατρία*. Almost to the same effect are the words of Pollux, 8. 111:—*ὅτε μέντοι τέσσαρες ἦσαν αἱ φυλαὶ εἰς τρία μέρη ἐκάστη διείρητο καὶ τὸ μέρος τοῦτο ἐκαλεῖτο τριττὺς καὶ ἔθνος καὶ φρατρία*. In both passages the employment of the singular has given rise to misapprehension; the grammarians, who were very imperfectly acquainted with the matter in question, thought that the four Phylæ consisted of twelve homogeneous portions; and not being aware that each ingredient of the division was distinguished by a particular quality, they merely assigned three different names to each of the twelve supposed parts, without making any further distinction between them.

This is at variance with a passage in Photius, under *τριττὺς*· in which Aristotle's account has been preserved to us, *τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῆς φυλῆς· αὕτη γὰρ διήρηται εἰς τρία μέρη, τριττὺς καὶ ἔθνη καὶ φρατρίας, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλη φησίν*. Comp. the Etym. Mag. where the name of Aristotle is not mentioned. Here the use of the *καὶ* clearly proves that the Trittyes, Phratriæ, and Ethne, had each an essentially different character; had they been undistinguishable in their qualities, *ἢ* would have been used. To this must be added the Scholium on Plat. de Repub. p. 409, Tauchn.: *Ἀθήνησι δέκα μὲν ἦσαν φυλαί· διήροντο δ' ἐκάστη τούτων εἰς τρία, εἰς τριττύας, εἰς ἔθνη καὶ φρατρίας*, where the *εἰς* speaks still more plainly than the foregoing *καί*, whilst the applicability of the passage is by no means diminished from the circumstance of its referring to the Phylæ of Clisthenes.

But it may possibly be attempted to draw a second proof, that of the identity of the three members of the division in question from the fact, that families are not only represented as the subdivision of the Trittyes in the passage of Mœris cited above, but that Pollux likewise describes families as the uniform subdivision of the three parts, namely, 3. 52: *φρατρίαι δ' ἦσαν δυοκαίδεκα καὶ ἐν ἐκάστη*

γένη τριάκοντα, ἕκαστον ἐκ τριάκοντα ἀνδρῶν (comp. Harpocratio under γεννῆται.—πάλιν δὲ τῶν φρατριῶν ἐκάστη διήρητο εἰς γένη τριάκοντα), which is true. But he is in error 8. 111 :—ἐκάστου δὲ ἔθνους γένη τριάκοντα, ἃ ἐκαλεῖτο τριάκαδες, etc. Finally, 8. 109: τριπτύος δ' ἐκάστης γένη τρία, which involves a double “*falsum*,” inasmuch as a misrepresentation of the fact is combined with corruption of the text; for consistency in error would have required the reading τριάκοντα.

But the false impressions calculated to arise from this are counteracted by the testimony of Aristotle apud Phot. ναυκραρία.—ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους πολιτείας—ἐκ δὲ τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστης ἦσαν νενεμημένοι τριπτύες μὲν τρεῖς, ναυκραρίαι δὲ δώδεκα καθ' ἐκάστην, and it is more especially upon this that the proofs of the essential difference between the parts of the threefold division in question must be grounded.

END OF VOL. I.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY



3 1867 00069 2975

938 W12h v.1

Wachsmuth, Wilhelm, 1784-
1866.

The historical antiquities
of the Greeks

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES LIBRARY
PHILLIPS ACADEMY
ANDOVER, MASS.

